

Vol. XXVII.

OCTOBER, 1950.

No. 4

THE AUSTRALASIAN Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY
AND RELIGIOUS



*The Official Organ for communications issued by the
Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.*

Announcements

MSS., queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all Queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: *Yearly, in advance, 15/-.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—A.C.R. Staff.

Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.

Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. J. L. Dunn, Wellington, N.Z.

Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.

Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, Banyo, Q.

Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. J. Wallis, Launceston, Tas.

Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Cobargo, N.S.W.

Diocese of Armidale—Rev. J. Healy, Armidale, N.S.W.

Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.

Diocese of Ballarat—V. Rev. E. Glowrey, St. Arnaud, Vic.

Diocese of Bathurst—V. Rev. M. J. Dunne, B.A., Adm. Bathurst, N.S.W.

Diocese of Cairns—Rev. E. C. Clifford, O.S.A., Tully, Q.

Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. T. Liddy, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.

Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.

Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, Dunedin, N.Z.

Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. Bryan Gallagher, Ph.D., Three Springs, W.A.

Diocese of Lismore—V. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., Smithtown, N.S.W.

Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Waratah, N.S.W.

Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.

Diocese of Rockhampton—V. Rev. P. J. Walsh, D.D., Adm., Rockhampton, Q.

Diocese of Sale—V. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, Vic.

Diocese of Sandhurst—Rev. J. Hussey, Bright, Vic.

Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.

Diocese of Townsville—Very Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.

Diocese of Wagga—V. Rev. J. Larkins, P.P., Junee, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—Very Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.

Editor:
V. Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,
St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS,

Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 285

Encyclical *Humani Generis*—Bull appointing Bishop Lyons Auxiliary to His Eminence the Cardinal-Archbishop of Sydney—Warning of Holy Office about communist youth associations—Condemnation of books—New collection of prayers and pious works enriched with indulgences.

DILLON OF BALMAIN, II Rev. Roger Wynne 301

ST. THOMAS'S WORLD AND HIS "WAYS",

Rev. Cornelius Roberts, D.D., Ph.D. 311

BISHOP WILLSON, V,

Rt. Rev. Mgr. John H. Cullen, V.G., B.A. 317

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY Rev. Thomas Muldoon, D.D. 334

The Theology of the Mass. I.

MORAL THEOLOGY AND CANON LAW,

Rt. Rev. Mgr. James Carroll, P.P., D.C.L. 342

Eucharistic Fast for attendants of sick by night and certain classes of sick—Faculties subdelegated by bishop; use outside one's own diocese—Does favour cease when ordinary's faculty to grant favour ceases?—Child of non-Catholic parents baptized privately in danger of death—Sins against Social Justice—Occasion of Sin—Parent's obligation for child's religious education.

LITURGY Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 353

Notes concerning the Church and its furnishings, V (Rev. R. F. Donohoe);—Why odd number of prayers in the Mass?—Is prayer *Fidelium* addressed to God the Father?—Colour of vestments on feast of St. John the Baptist—Common of Popes—Votive Mass of Our Lady on Saturday—Motets during High Mass—Note on Mass without a server.

HOMILETICS Rev. Walter Baker, D.D., Ph.D. 360

Feast of All Saints and Commemoration of All Souls.

NOTES 364

The Jesuits and the Last Days of Hitler—The Catholic Biblical Association of England (See p. 333).

BOOK REVIEWS 368

Breviarium Romanum (Ed. Marietti); *Crossroads* (M.E.H.); *The Holy Year* (Thurston) [p. 300]; *Way of the Cross* (Ed. Bryant) [p. 341]; *The Osterley Selection from the Latin Fathers* (Ed. Crehan) [p. 341]; *The Transactions of the Catholic Medical Guild of St. Luke* [p. 359]; *The Spirituality of Saint Therese* (Combes) [p. 363]; *Fecondazione Artificiale, La* (Gemelli).

GENERAL INDEX FOR VOLUME XXVII 372

Nihil Obstat :

RICHARDUS COLLENDER

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur :

✠ N.T. CARD. GILROY,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

1a die, Octobris, 1950.

Official Documents

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS POPE PIUS XII—

“To Our Venerable Brethren, Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, Bishops, and other Local Ordinaries enjoying Peace and Communion with the Holy See, Concerning Some False Opinions which Threaten to Undermine the Foundations of Catholic Doctrine”.

Venerable Brethren, Health and Apostolic Benediction

Disagreement and error among men on moral and religious matters have always been a cause of profound sorrow to all good men, but above all to the true and loyal sons of the Church, especially to-day, when we see the principles of Christian culture being attacked on all sides.

It is not surprising that such discord and error should always have existed outside the fold of Christ. For though, absolutely speaking, human reason by its own natural force and light can arrive at a true and certain knowledge of the one personal God, Who by His providence watches over and governs the world, and also of the natural law, which the Creator has written in our hearts, still there are not a few obstacles to prevent reason from making efficient and fruitful use of its natural ability. The truths that have to do with God and the relations between God and men, completely surpass the sensible order and demand self-surrender and self-abnegation in order to be put into practice and to influence practical life. Now the human intellect in gaining the knowledge of such truths is hampered both by the activity of the senses and the imagination, and by evil passions arising from original sin. Hence men easily persuade themselves in such matters that what they do not wish to believe is false or at least doubtful.

It is for this reason that divine revelation must be considered morally necessary so that those religious and moral truths which are not of their nature beyond the reach of reason in the present condition of the human race, may be known with a firm certainty and with freedom from all error.¹

Furthermore the human intelligence sometimes experiences difficulty in forming a judgment about the credibility of the Catholic faith, notwithstanding the many wonderful external signs God has given, which are sufficient to prove with certitude by the unaided light of natural

¹Conc. Vatic. D.B., 1786, Const. *De Fide cath.*, cap. 2, *De revelatione*.

reason the divine origin of the Christian religion. For man can, whether from prejudice or passion or bad faith, refuse and resist not only the evidence of the external proofs that are available, but also divine inspiration.

If anyone examines the state of affairs outside the Christian fold, he will easily discover the principal trends that not a few learned men are following. Some imprudently and indiscreetly hold that evolution, which has not been fully proved even in the domain of natural sciences, explains the origin of all things, and audaciously support the monistic and pantheistic opinion that the world is in continual evolution. Communists gladly subscribe to this opinion so that, when the souls of men have been deprived of every idea of God, they may the more efficaciously defend and propagate their dialectical materialism.

The fictitious tenets of evolution which repudiate all that is absolute, firm and immutable, have paved the way for the new erroneous philosophy, which, opposing itself to idealism, immanentism and pragmatism, has assumed the name of existentialism, since it concerns itself only with the existence of individual things and neglects all consideration of their immutable essences.

There is also a certain historicism, which, giving value only to the events of man's life, overthrows the foundation of all truth and absolute law both in regard to philosophical speculations and especially to Christian dogmas.

In all this confusion of opinion it is some consolation to Us to see former adherents of rationalism to-day not uncommonly desiring to return to the fountain of divine truth, and to acknowledge and profess the word of God as contained in Sacred Scripture as the foundation of all religious teaching. But at the same time it is a matter of regret that not a few of these, the more firmly they accept the word of God, so much the more do they diminish the value of human reason, and the more they exalt the authority of God the Revealer, the more severely do they spurn the teaching office of the Church, which has been instituted by Christ, Our Lord, to preserve and interpret divine revelation. This attitude is not only plainly at variance with Holy Scripture, but is shown to be false by experience also. For often those who disagree with the true Church complain openly of their disagreement in matters of dogma and thus unwillingly bear witness to the necessity of a living Teaching Authority.

Now Catholic theologians and philosophers, whose grave duty it is

to defend natural and supernatural truth and instil it in the hearts of men, cannot afford to ignore or neglect these more or less erroneous opinions. Rather they must come to understand these same theories well, both because diseases are not properly treated unless they are rightly diagnosed, and because sometimes even in these false theories a certain amount of truth is contained, and, finally, because these theories provoke more subtle discussion and evaluation of philosophical and theological truths.

If philosophers and theologians strive merely to derive profit from the careful examination of these doctrines, there is no reason for an appeal to the teaching authority of the Church. However, although we know that Catholic teachers generally avoid these errors, it is apparent that some to-day, as in apostolic times, desirous of novelty, and fearing to be considered ignorant of recent scientific findings, tend to withdraw from the sacred Teaching Authority and are accordingly in danger of gradually departing from revealed truth and of drawing others along with them into error.

Another danger is perceived which is all the more serious because it is more concealed beneath the mask of virtue. There are many who, deploring disagreement among men and intellectual confusion, through an imprudent zeal for souls, are urged by a great and ardent desire to do away with the barrier that divides good and honest men; these advocate an "eirenism" according to which, by setting aside the questions which divide men, they aim not only at joining forces to repel the attacks of atheism, but also at reconciling their differences in dogma. And as in former times some questioned whether the traditional apologetics of the Church did not constitute an obstacle rather than a help to the winning of souls for Christ, so to-day some go so far as to question seriously whether theology and theological methods, such as with the approval of ecclesiastical authority are found in our schools, should not only be perfected, but also completely reformed, in order to promote the more efficacious propagation of the kingdom of Christ everywhere throughout the world among men of every culture and religious opinion.

Now if these only aimed at adapting ecclesiastical teaching and methods to modern conditions and requirements, through the introduction of some new system, there would be scarcely any reason for alarm. But some through enthusiasm for an imprudent "eirenism" seem to consider as an obstacle to the restoration of fraternal union tenets

founded on the laws and principles given by Christ and likewise on institutions founded by Him, or which are the defence and support of the integrity of the faith, and the removal of which would bring about the union of all, but only to their destruction.

These new opinions, whether they originate from a reprehensible desire of novelty or from a laudable motive, are not always advanced in the same degree, with equal clarity nor in the same terms, nor always with the unanimous agreement of their authors. Theories that to-day are put forward rather covertly by some, not without cautions and distinctions, to-morrow are openly and without moderation proclaimed by others more audacious, causing scandal to many, especially among the young clergy and to the detriment of ecclesiastical authority. Though they are more cautious in their published works, they are more open in their writings intended for private circulation and in conferences and lectures. Moreover, these opinions are published not only among members of either clergy and in seminaries and religious institutions, but also among the laity, and especially among those who are engaged in teaching youth.

In theology some want to reduce to a minimum the meaning of dogmas, and to free dogma itself from terminology long established in the Church and from philosophical concepts held by Catholic teachers, and to return in the explanation of Catholic doctrine to the way of speaking used in Holy Scripture and by the Fathers of the Church. They cherish the hope that when dogma is stripped of the elements which they hold to be extrinsic to divine revelation, it will compare advantageously with the opinions of those who are separated from the unity of the Church and that in this way they will gradually arrive at a mutual assimilation of Catholic dogma and the tenets of the dissidents.

Moreover they assert that, when Catholic doctrine has been reduced to this condition, a way will be found to satisfy modern needs, that will permit of dogma being expressed also by the concepts of modern philosophy, whether of immanentism or idealism or existentialism or any other system. Some more audacious affirm that this can and must be done, because they hold that the mysteries of faith are never expressed by truly adequate concepts but only by approximate and ever changeable notions, in which the truth is to some extent expressed, but is necessarily distorted. Wherefore they do not consider it absurd, but altogether necessary, that theology should substitute new concepts in place of the old ones in keeping with the various philosophies which in the

course of time it uses as its instruments, so that it should give human expression to divine truths in various ways which are even somewhat opposed, but still equivalent, as they say.

Unfortunately these advocates of novelty easily pass from despising scholastic theology to the neglect of and even contempt for the Teaching Authority of the Church itself, which gives such authoritative approval to scholastic theology. This Teaching Authority is represented by them as a hindrance to progress and an obstacle in the way of science. By some non-Catholics it is considered as an unjust restraint preventing some more qualified theologians from reforming their subject. And, although this sacred Office of Teacher in matters of faith and morals must be the proximate and universal criterion of truth for all theologians, since to it has been entrusted by Christ Our Lord the whole deposit of faith—Sacred Scripture and divine Tradition—to be preserved, guarded and interpreted, still the duty that is incumbent on the faithful to flee also those errors which more or less approach heresy, and accordingly “to keep also the constitutions and decrees by which such evil opinions are proscribed and forbidden by the Holy See”,² is sometimes as little known as if it did not exist. What is expounded in the Encyclical Letters of the Roman Pontiffs concerning the nature and constitution of the Church is deliberately and habitually neglected by some with the idea of giving force to a certain vague notion which they profess to have found in the ancient Fathers, especially the Greeks. The Popes, they assert, do not wish to pass judgment on what is a matter of dispute among theologians, so recourse must be had to the early sources, and the recent constitutions and decrees of the Teaching Church must be explained from the writings of the ancients.

Although this seems well said, still it is not free from error. It is true that Popes generally leave theologians free in those matters which are disputed by reputable theologians; but history teaches that many matters that formerly were open to discussion, no longer now admit of discussion.

Nor must it be thought that what is expounded in Encyclical Letters does not of itself demand consent, since in writing such Letters the Popes do not exercise the supreme power of their Teaching Authority. For these matters are taught with the ordinary teaching authority, of which it is true to say: “He who heareth you, heareth Me”;³ and gener-

²C.I.C., can. 1324; cfr. Conc. Vat., D.B., 1820, Const. *De Fide cath.*, cap. 4, *De Fide et ratione*, post canones.

³Luke, X, 16.

ally what is expounded and inculcated in Encyclical Letters already for other reasons appertains to Catholic doctrine. But if the Supreme Pontiffs in their official documents purposely pass judgment on a matter up to that time under dispute, it is obvious that that matter, according to the mind and will of the same Pontiffs, cannot be any longer considered a question open to discussion among theologians.

It is also true that theologians must always return to the sources of divine revelation: for it belongs to them to point out how the doctrine of the living Teaching Authority is to be found either explicitly or implicitly in the Scriptures and in the Tradition.⁴ Besides, each source of divinely revealed doctrine contains so many rich treasures of truth, that they can really never be exhausted. Hence it is that theology through the study of its sacred sources remains ever fresh; on the other hand, speculation which neglects a deeper search into the deposit of faith, proves sterile, as we know from experience. But for this reason even positive theology cannot be on a par with merely historical science. For, together with the sources of positive theology, God has given to His Church a living Teaching Authority to elucidate and explain what is contained in the deposit of faith only obscurely and implicitly. This deposit of Faith our Divine Redeemer has given for authentic interpretation not to each of the faithful, not even to theologians, but only to the Teaching Authority of the Church. But if the Church does exercise this function of teaching, as she often has through the centuries, either in the ordinary or extraordinary way, it is clear how false is a procedure which would attempt to explain what is clear by means of what is obscure. Indeed the very opposite procedure must be used. Hence Our Predecessor of immortal memory, Pius IX, teaching that the most noble office of theology is to show how a doctrine defined by the Church is contained in the sources of revelation, added these words, and with very good reason: "in that sense in which it has been defined by the Church."

To return, however, to the new opinions mentioned above, a number of things are proposed or suggested by some even against the divine authorship of Sacred Scripture. For some go so far as to pervert the sense of the Vatican Council's definition that God is the author of Holy Scripture, and they put forward again the opinion, already often condemned, which asserts that immunity from error extends only to those parts of the Bible that treat of God or of moral and religious matters. They even wrongly speak of the human sense of the Scrip-

⁴Pius IX, *Inter gravissimas*, 28 Oct., 1870, *Acta*, vol. I, p. 260.

tures, beneath which the divine sense, which they say is the only infallible meaning, lies hidden. In interpreting Scripture, they will take no account of the analogy of faith and the Tradition of the Church. Thus they judge the doctrine of the Fathers and of the Teaching Church by the norm of Holy Scripture, interpreted by the purely human reason of exegetes, instead of explaining Holy Scripture according to the mind of the Church which Christ our Lord has appointed guardian and interpreter of the whole deposit of divinely revealed truth.

Further, according to their fictitious opinions, the literal sense of Holy Scripture and its explanation, carefully worked out under the Church's vigilance by so many great exegetes, should yield now to a new exegesis, which they are pleased to call symbolic or spiritual. By means of this new exegesis the Old Testament, which to-day in the Church is a sealed book, would finally be thrown open to all the faithful. By this method, they say, all difficulties vanish, difficulties which hinder only those who adhere to the literal meaning of the Scriptures.

Everyone sees how foreign all this is to the principles and norms of interpretation rightly fixed by our predecessors of happy memory, Leo XIII in his Encyclical "Providentissimus," and Benedict XV in the Encyclical "Spiritus Paraclitus," as also by Ourselves in the Encyclical "Divino afflante Spiritu".

It is not surprising that novelties of this kind have already borne their deadly fruit in almost all branches of theology. It is now doubted that human reason, without divine revelation and the help of divine grace, can, by arguments drawn from the created universe, prove the existence of a personal God; it is denied that the world had a beginning; it is argued that the creation of the world is necessary, since it proceeds from the necessary liberality of divine love; it is denied that God has eternal and infallible foreknowledge of the free actions of men—all this in contradiction to the decrees of the Vatican Council.⁵

Some also question whether angels are personal beings, and whether matter and spirit differ essentially. Others destroy the gratuity of the supernatural order, since God, they say, cannot create intellectual beings without ordering and calling them to the beatific vision. Nor is this all. Disregarding the Council of Trent, some pervert the very concept of original sin, along with the concept of sin in general as an offence against God, as well as the idea of satisfaction performed for us by

⁵Cfr. Conc. Vat., Const. *De Fide cath.*, cap. 1, *De Deo rerum omnium creatore*.

Christ. Some even say that the doctrine of transubstantiation, based on an antiquated philosophic notion of substance, should be so modified that the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist be reduced to a kind of symbolism, whereby the consecrated species would be merely efficacious signs of the spiritual presence of Christ and of His intimate union with the faithful members of His Mystical Body.

Some say they are not bound by the doctrine, explained in Our Encyclical Letter of a few years ago, and based on the sources of revelation, which teaches that the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same thing.⁶ Some reduce to a meaningless formula the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to gain salvation. Others finally belittle the reasonable character of the credibility of Christian faith.

These and like errors, it is clear, have crept in among certain of Our sons who are deceived by imprudent zeal for souls or by false science. To them We are compelled with grief to repeat once again truths already well known, and to point out with solicitude clear errors and dangers of error.

It is well known how highly the Church regards human reason, for it falls to reason to demonstrate with certainty the existence of God, personal and one; to prove beyond doubt from divine signs the very foundations of the Christian faith; to express properly the law which the Creator has imprinted in the hearts of men; and finally to attain to some notion, indeed a very fruitful notion, of mysteries.⁷ But reason can perform these functions safely and well, only when properly trained, that is, when imbued with that sound philosophy which has long been, as it were, a patrimony handed down by earlier Christian ages, and which moreover possesses an authority of even higher order, since the Teaching Authority of the Church, in the light of divine revelation itself, has weighed its fundamental tenets, which have been elaborated and defined little by little by men of great genius. For this philosophy, acknowledged and accepted by the Church, safeguards the genuine validity of human knowledge, the unshakable metaphysical principles of sufficient reason, causality, and finality, and finally the mind's ability to attain certain and unchangeable truth.

Of course this philosophy deals with much that neither directly nor indirectly touches faith or morals, and which consequently the

⁶Cfr. Litt. Enc. *Mystici Corporis Christi*, A.A.S., vol. XXXV, p. 193 sq.

⁷Cfr. Conc. Vat., D.B., 1796.

Church leaves to the free discussion of experts. But this does not hold for many other things, especially those principles and fundamental tenets to which We have just referred. However, even in these fundamental questions, we may clothe our philosophy in a more convenient and richer dress, make it more vigorous with a more effective terminology, divest it of certain scholastic aids found less useful, prudently enrich it with the fruits of progress of the human mind. But never may we overthrow it, or contaminate it with false principles, or regard it as a great, but obsolete, relic. For truth and its philosophic expression cannot change from day to day, least of all where there is question of self-evident principles of the human mind or of those propositions which are supported by the wisdom of the ages and by divine revelation. Whatever new truth the sincere human mind is able to find, certainly cannot be opposed to truth already acquired, since God, the highest Truth, has created and guides the human intellect, not that it may daily oppose new truths to rightly established ones, but rather that, having eliminated errors which may have crept in, it may build truth upon truth in the same order and structure that exist in reality, the source of truth. Let no Christian therefore, whether philosopher or theologian, embrace eagerly and lightly whatever novelty happens to be thought up from day to day, but rather let him weigh it with painstaking care and a balanced judgment, lest he lose or corrupt the truth he already has, with grave danger and damage to his faith.

If one considers all this well, he will easily see why the Church demands that future priests be instructed in philosophy "according to the method, doctrine, and principles of the Angelic Doctor"⁸, since, as we well know from the experience of centuries, the method of Aquinas is singularly preeminent both for teaching students and for bringing truth to light; his doctrine is in harmony with divine revelation, and is most effective both for safeguarding the foundation of the faith, and for reaping, safely and usefully, the fruits of sound progress.⁹

How deplorable it is then that this philosophy, received and honoured by the Church, is scorned by some, who shamelessly call it outmoded in form and rationalistic, as they say, in its method of thought. They say that this philosophy upholds the erroneous notion that there can be a metaphysic that is absolutely true; whereas in fact, they say, reality, especially transcendent reality, cannot better be expressed than

⁸C.I.C., can. 1366, 2.

⁹A.A.S., vol. XXXVIII, 1946, p. 387.

by different propositions, which mutually complete each other, although they are in a way mutually opposed. Our traditional philosophy, then, with its clear exposition and solution of questions, its accurate definition of terms, its clear-cut distinctions, can be, they concede, useful as a preparation for scholastic theology, a preparation quite in accord with medieval mentality; but this philosophy hardly offers a method of philosophizing suited to the needs of our modern culture. They allege, finally, that our perennial philosophy is only a philosophy of immutable essences, while the contemporary mind must look to the existence of things and to life, which is ever in flux. While scorning our philosophy, they extol other philosophies of all kinds, ancient and modern, oriental and occidental, by which they seem to imply that any kind of philosophy or theory, with a few additions and corrections if need be, can be reconciled with Catholic dogma. No Catholic can doubt how false this is, especially where there is question of those fictitious theories they call immanentism, or idealism, or materialism, whether historic or dialectic, or even existentialism, whether atheistic or simply the type that denies the validity of the reason in the field of metaphysics.

Finally, they reproach this philosophy taught in our schools for regarding only the intellect in the process of cognition, while neglecting the function of the will and the emotions. This is simply not true. Never has Christian philosophy denied the usefulness and efficacy of good dispositions of soul for perceiving and embracing moral and religious truths. In fact, it has always taught that the lack of these dispositions of good will can be the reason why the intellect, influenced by the passions and evil inclinations, can be so obscured that it cannot see clearly. Indeed St. Thomas holds that the intellect can in some way perceive higher goods of the moral order, whether natural or supernatural, inasmuch as it experiences a certain "connaturality" with these goods, whether this "connaturality" be purely natural, or the result of grace;¹⁰ and it is clear how much even this somewhat obscure perception can help the reason in its investigations. However it is one thing to admit the power of the dispositions of the will in helping reason to gain a more certain and firm knowledge of moral truths; it is quite another thing to say, as these innovators do, indiscriminately mingling cognition and act of will, that the appetitive and affective faculties have a certain power of understanding, and that man, since he cannot by using his

¹⁰Cfr. S. Thom., *Summa Theol.*, II-II, quest. 1, art. 4 ad 3 et quaest. 45, art. 2, in c.

reason decide with certainty what is true and is to be accepted, turns to his will, by which he freely chooses among opposite opinions.

It is not surprising that these new opinions endanger the two philosophical sciences which by their very nature are closely connected with the doctrine of faith, that is, theodicy and ethics; they hold that the function of these two sciences is not to prove with certitude anything about God or any other transcendental being, but rather to show that the truths which faith teaches about a personal God and about His precepts, are perfectly consistent with the necessities of life and are therefore to be accepted by all, in order to avoid despair and to attain eternal salvation. All these opinions and affirmations are openly contrary to the documents of Our Predecessors Leo XIII and Pius X, and cannot be reconciled with the decrees of the Vatican Council. It would indeed be unnecessary to deplore these aberrations from the truth, if all, even in the field of philosophy, directed their attention with the proper reverence to the Teaching Authority of the Church, which by divine institution has the mission not only to guard and interpret the deposit of divinely revealed truth, but also to keep watch over the philosophical sciences themselves, in order that Catholic dogmas may suffer no harm because of erroneous opinions.

It remains for Us now to speak about those questions which, although they pertain to the positive sciences, are nevertheless more or less connected with the truths of the Christian faith. In fact, not a few insistently demand that the Catholic religion take these sciences into account as much as possible. This certainly would be praiseworthy in the case of clearly proved facts; but caution must be used when there is rather question of hypotheses, having some sort of scientific foundation, in which the doctrine contained in Sacred Scripture or in Tradition is involved. If such conjectural opinions are directly or indirectly opposed to the doctrine revealed by God, then the demand that they be recognized can in no way be admitted.

For these reasons the Teaching Authority of the Church does not forbid that, in conformity with the present state of human sciences and sacred theology, research and discussions, on the part of men experienced in both fields, take place with regard to the doctrine of evolution, in as far as it inquires into the origin of the human body as coming from pre-existent and living matter—for the Catholic faith obliges us to hold that souls are immediately created by God. However this must be done in such a way that the reasons for both opinions, that is, those

favorable and those unfavorable to evolution, be weighed and judged with the necessary seriousness, moderation and measure, and provided that all are prepared to submit to the judgment of the Church, to whom Christ has given the mission of interpreting authentically the Sacred Scriptures and of defending the dogmas of faith.¹¹ Some however rashly transgress this liberty of discussion, when they act as if the origin of the human body from preexisting and living matter were already completely certain and proved by the facts which have been discovered up to now and by reasoning on those facts, and as if there were nothing in the sources of divine revelation which demands the greatest moderation and caution in this question.

When, however, there is question of another conjectural opinion, namely polygenism, the children of the Church by no means enjoy such liberty. For the faithful cannot embrace that opinion which maintains either that after Adam there existed on this earth true men who did not take their origin through natural generation from him as from the first parent of all, or that Adam represents a certain number of first parents. Now it is in no way apparent how such an opinion can be reconciled with that which the source of revealed truth and the documents of the Teaching Authority of the Church propose with regard to original sin, which proceeds from a sin actually committed by an individual Adam and which through generation is passed on to all and is in everyone as his own.¹²

Just as in the biological and anthropological sciences, so also in the historical sciences there are those who boldly transgress the limits and safeguards established by the Church. In a particular way must be deplored a certain too free interpretation of the historical books of the Old Testament. Those who favour this system, in order to defend their cause, wrongly refer to the Letter which was sent not long ago to the Archbishop of Paris by the Pontifical Commission on Biblical Studies.¹³ This Letter, in fact, clearly points out that the first eleven chapters of Genesis, although properly speaking not conforming to the historical method used by the best Greek and Latin writers or by competent authors of our time, do nevertheless pertain to history in a true sense, which however must be further studied and determined by exegetes; the same chapters, (the Letter points out), in simple and metaphorical language

¹¹Cfr. Allocut. Pont. to the members of the Academy of Science, November 30, 1941: *A.A.S.*, vol. XXXIII, p. 506.

¹²Cfr. *Rom.*, V, 12-19; Conc. Trid., sess. V, can. 1-4.

¹³January 16, 1948: *A.A.S.*, vol. XL, pp. 45-48.

adapted to the mentality of a people but little cultured, both state the principal truths which are fundamental for our salvation, and also give a popular description of the origin of the human race and the chosen people. If, however, the ancient sacred writers have taken anything from popular narrations (and this may be conceded), it must never be forgotten that they did so with the help of divine inspiration, through which they were rendered immune from any error in selecting and evaluating those documents.

Therefore whatever of the popular narrations have been inserted into the Sacred Scriptures must in no way be considered on a par with myths or other such things, which are more the product of an extravagant imagination than of that striving for truth and simplicity which in the Sacred Books, also of the Old Testament, is so apparent that our ancient sacred writers must be admitted to be clearly superior to the ancient profane writers.

Truly, we are aware that the majority of Catholic doctors, the fruit of whose studies is being gathered in universities, in seminaries, and in the colleges of religious, are far removed from those errors which to-day, whether through a desire of novelty or through a certain immoderate zeal for the apostolate, are being spread either openly or covertly. But we know also that such new opinions can entice the incautious; and therefore we prefer to withstand the very beginnings rather than to administer the medicine after the disease has grown inveterate.

For this reason, after mature reflexion and consideration before God, that We may not be wanting in Our sacred duty, We charge the Bishops and the Superiors General of Religious Orders, binding them most seriously in conscience, to take most diligent care that such opinions be not advanced in schools, in conferences or in writings of any kind, and that they be not taught in any manner whatsoever to the clergy or the faithful.

Let the teachers in ecclesiastical institutions be aware that they cannot with tranquil conscience exercise the office of teaching entrusted to them, unless in the instruction of their students they religiously accept and exactly observe the norms which We have ordained. That due reverence and submission which in their unceasing labor they must profess towards the Teaching Authority of the Church, let them instill also into the minds and hearts of their students.

Let them strive with every force and effort to further the progress

of the sciences which they teach; but let them also be careful not to transgress the limits which we have established for the protection of the truth of Catholic faith and doctrine. With regard to new questions, which modern culture and progress have brought to the foreground, let them engage in most careful research, but with the necessary prudence and caution; finally, let them not think, indulging in a false "eirenism", that the dissident and erring can happily be brought back to the bosom of the Church, if the whole truth found in the Church is not sincerely taught to all without corruption or diminution.

Relying on this hope, which will be increased by your pastoral care, as a pledge of celestial gifts and a sign of Our paternal benevolence, We impart with all Our heart to each and all of you, Venerable Brethren, and to your clergy and people the Apostolic Benediction.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, August 12, 1950, the twelfth year of Our Pontificate.

PIUS PP. XII.

*

*

*

*

Papal Bull

appointing His Lordship Bishop Patrick Francis Lyons Titular Bishop of Cabasa and Auxiliary to His Eminence Cardinal Gilroy, Archbishop of Sydney.

PIUS BISHOP

servant of the servants of God
to Our Venerable Brother Patrick Francis Lyons
hitherto Bishop of Christchurch, Titular Bishop
Elect of Cabasa and Auxiliary Bishop to
the present Archbishop of Sydney
health and apostolic blessing

In accordance with the office of supreme apostolate, with which We are charged, We make it Our care that Bishops, especially those who are ruling dioceses of very vast territorial extension and of very great population, should have Auxiliary Bishops to help them effectively in the exercise of pontifical functions and other pastoral duties. To these Auxiliary Bishops the Apostolic See is accustomed to assign some one of the titles of those churches which in former days shone with the splendour of virtues and enjoyed a prosperous state of religion, but which have now through the vicissitudes and spoiling hand of time lost the pristine glory which made them illustrious. Hence desiring to accede to the petition of Our Beloved Son, Norman Gilroy,

Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church and present Archbishop of Sydney, who represented to this Apostolic See that, in view of a fuller and more abundant pastoral care over all the faithful who live in the vast territory of his Archdiocese, another Auxiliary Bishop should be given to him, We have decided, after consulting Our Beloved Son the Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, to entrust this office to you. Therefore, out of the fulness of Our Apostolic power We release you from the bond of the Cathedral Church of Christchurch, which you have hitherto ruled as Bishop, and We transfer you to the Titular Episcopal Church of Cabasa in the Second Province of Egypt, now vacant through the death of Bishop Prudentius Contarvo of happy memory; and We appoint and declare you Auxiliary Bishop to the aforesaid present Archbishop of Sydney, so that with his permission you can and may exercise pontifical functions and other pastoral offices in the city and in the whole Archdiocese of Sydney. Moreover, in virtue of the same supreme Apostolic power which We hold, We dispense you from the profession of faith and from the oath of fidelity, the repetition of which is enjoined by law. We firmly hope and are confident that the Church of Sydney, through your assiduous co-operation with its Archbishop, will, by God's favour, progress and increase both in spiritual and temporal blessings.

Given at Rome, from St. Peter's, in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and fifty, on the eighth day of the month of March, in the eleventh year of Our pontificate.

For the Chancellor of the Holy Roman Church,

+ F. Card. MARCHETTI SELVAGGIANI,

Dean of the Sacred College.

*

*

*

*

SUPREME SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE.

A warning issued by this supreme Congregation (July 28, 1950) is directed against Associations of Communist inspiration founded with the purpose of imbuing boys and girls with principles and mentality which are materialistic and opposed to Christian faith and morals.

These Associations fall under the sanctions of a former decree of the Holy Office (July 1, 1949).

1) Therefore parents or guardians who, contrary to the ruling of canon 1372 § 2 of the Code of Canon Law and to the aforesaid decree

hand over children to the aforesaid Associations for training cannot be admitted to the Sacraments.

2) Those who impart to boys or girls teaching against faith and Christian morals incur excommunication specially reserved to the Apostolic See.

3) Boys and girls, as long as they belong to such Associations cannot be admitted to the Sacraments.

* * * *

The Holy Office has also declared precondemned and inserted in the Index of Prohibited Books a book written by Curtius Malaparte and entitled "*La Pelle, Storia e racconto*" (June 16, 1950); also a book of Bruno Ughi entitled "*La Via*", first and second editions (July 18, 1950).

* * * *

SACRED APOSTOLIC PENITENTIARY.

A decree given from the Office of Indulgences, under date of January 30, 1950, approves a new collection of prayers and pious works enriched with indulgences. As this collection abrogates all previous concessions not contained in it, and adds new concessions, it will henceforth be the authoritative *Raccolta* of indulgenced prayers and works.

W. LEONARD.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

THE HOLY YEAR. A practical summary of the required visits and conditions. By Fr. Herbert Thurston, S.J., 49 pages. Price, 2/9. Publishers: Sands and Co.

In this opportune booklet we are presented with a reprint, in abridged form, of the larger work, "*The Holy Year of Jubilee*", published in 1900 by the same author.

Many references are made to the testimonies of both ancient and recent writers, and to those of Pilgrims of many Ages, in the detailed history of the four major basilicas of Rome which comprises the first portion of the work. A visit to these churches is a necessary requirement for the gaining of the ordinary Jubilee indulgence.

Whenever possible, information in the usual guide-books is not repeated, but many supplementary details are given, which will be of great assistance to Pilgrims in capturing the tradition and atmosphere of the churches visited.

The second section is a concise and sufficiently complete summary of the conditions and regulations pertaining to the observance of the Jubilee, and the gaining of the indulgence.

Pilgrims who desire a reliable hand-book, and the Faithful in general who wish to learn more about the nature of the Holy Year, will find this booklet valuable and most interesting.

M.N.

Dillon of Balmain, II.

Summary: Troubles consequent upon the O'Farrell incident of 1868—Fr. Dillon takes a hand in laying a ghost—Departure from Balmain—Church and school building programme at Camden—Successful experiment among Aborigines—Return to Balmain—Scavenger's daughter causes trouble—Story of the *Express*—Departure from Australia—Fr. Dillon as an author—Last years.

But the tragic succession of events narrated in the preceding chapter and culminating in the destruction by fire of two Cathedrals and in the loss of two such pillars of the Church as Fathers Therry and McEncroe were not the only happenings that made the years 1864-'69 particularly sad ones for the Church in New South Wales.

Of all the incredible ghost stories, and they are legion, that have from time to time helped to enliven Australian history none, not even Fisher's, created in its day more controversy, more ridicule, or more ill will than that which slightly more than eighty years ago was responsible for putting the little South Coast town of Kiama so prominently on the map of the world for all time. To Father John Dwyer, grandson of the famous Wicklow Chieftain, belongs the credit of finally "laying" this particularly obnoxious specimen by the simple but very effective method of proving conclusively to Parliament and to the world that it was never more than an ugly myth, a monstrous fabrication of a cunning and mendacious mind. Father Dillon's share, however, in allaying the hysteria created by the incident was sufficiently noteworthy to justify the ghost's uncanny and dramatic intrusion into these pages. But first a few words of explanation.

On 12th March, 1868, occurred the regrettable incident at Clontarf in which Prince Alfred, afterwards Duke of Edinburgh, was attacked and wounded by a mentally unbalanced lawyer named O'Farrell. Although it was clear to everybody that the unfortunate O'Farrell was not really responsible for his action, the fact that he happened to be a Catholic and an Irishman was seized upon at once by the Parkes-Martin Ministry, still smarting under the unrelenting attacks upon its Education Bill, to stir up ancient animosities and fan once more the smouldering fires of anti-Catholic and anti-Irish prejudice. Of the two principal instigators, Parkes and Martin, it would be difficult to say whose conduct was the more execrable. In a brazen speech to his constituents at Kiama, Parkes raised what has become known in Australian history as the "Kiama Ghost" by claiming that the incident at Clontarf was part of a great Fenian conspiracy, the existence of which had been known to

the Government for a considerable time. With colossal impudence he went on to give his spell-bound listeners particulars of the plot. "I can produce evidence attested by affidavits," he said, "which leaves no doubt in my mind that not only was the murder of the Prince planned, but that some person who was in the secret and whose fidelity was suspected was foully murdered". Not to be outdone by his Chief Secretary, the Premier, Sir James Martin, went one better by going through the farce of obtaining special police protection. Sir James, of whose apostasy, as we have already seen, Father Dillon was alleged to have spoken publicly at Balmain, had been indeed a Catholic. Born at Midleton, County Cork, and thus ironically enough a fellow countyman of both Father Dillon and Father Sheehy, he had been brought to Sydney by his parents in 1821, when he was but one year old. Law was his profession, and he eventually rose to be Chief Justice of the Colony. The Education Bill of 1866 heralded his first break with the Church of his fathers. The breach quickly widened and a short time later we find him addressing election meetings as "We Protestants", and referring contemptuously to the Bishop of Bathurst as "that priest with a Finnigan sort of a name".

Following on the Kiama outburst, public meetings denouncing Fenianism and vowing allegiance to the Crown quickly became the fashion. Every town, village and suburb had its organized demonstration at which the majority of the speakers, after the manner of the Pharisee of old, raised their hands and eyes to heaven and thanked God that they were not as the rest of men, disruptionists, revolutionaries, Fenians. Led on by the *Herald*, a hostile clique was clamouring for the blood of the *Freeman's Journal* and, sad to say, among those who joined in the hue and cry were Fathers Sheehy and Sheridan, who, speaking on behalf of the Archbishop at a public meeting at St. John's College, severely criticised the paper's open sympathy with the Manchester victims. Balmain, as might have been expected, was early in the field with what the papers described as an "indignation" meeting held in the Working Men's Institute. But, although the list of speakers included four Protestant clergymen and a formidable array of leading citizens, it is a pleasure to be able to record that the highlight of the evening was a magnificent speech by Father Dillon in which he effectively vindicated the loyalty and good citizenship of his people and gave their answer to those who were truculently demanding an apology from every Catholic in the Colony. Certain people, he said in effect, had challenged the

Catholic people to disavow any sympathy with the criminal who had attempted to assassinate the Prince. Why should they do so? Supposing an English Protestant chartist had attempted the life of the Queen, what would be said of the English Catholic who required the Protestants of England to disavow sympathy with the would-be murderer? Supposing the chartist were a Scotchman and a Presbyterian, what would the Scotch Presbyterians think of such a requisition to them by an English Protestant? The proposal was insolent and offensive, and he burned with indignation to find that it should be thought by any man in the slightest degree necessary that Catholics should come forward and disclaim their sympathy with murder. He thought it was an insult to Catholics to insinuate that they were bound to repudiate the act of an assassin. He spurned the assertion with indignation, believing that no necessity for such denial existed.

Not satisfied with that, he addressed shortly afterwards a warmly worded letter to the *Herald* in which he further developed his principal argument and closed on the following note: "He (the Prince) whose gentle courtesy won all hearts; he who so rigidly discountenanced the attempt to set section against section upon his arrival will be the first to declare to the world that the Catholic people who received him so warmly, and mourned for him so deeply, were in no way to blame for his unmeritted suffering. . . . It will be some consolation for him to know that from the very moment of his suffering there was not a Catholic congregation that did not offer up prayers to God for his speedy recovery. Never in my life did I see greater sorrow manifested than by the people I serve when on Friday morning I asked them to offer to God the most solemn act of their religion for the preservation of His Royal Highness". Whatever may be thought of the wisdom or unwisdom of all the arguments advanced by him, his efforts certainly helped to check the advance of anti-Catholic prejudice. And it was significant that at a great public rally held in Sydney to devise ways and means of erecting a suitable monument to the memory of the Prince he was selected as one of the principal speakers.

But the time had now arrived for Father Dillon and his faithful people to part. In the distant valley of Burragorang, by the peaceful waters of the Wollondilly, an entirely new kind of work, wholly congenial to his ardent spirit, was waiting for him. And so in January, 1869, to the great disappointment of Catholics all over Sydney who had hoped to see the cruel injustice of his dismissal from the chaplaincy re-

dressed by the incoming Robertson ministry, an exchange was effected by which Father Dillon removed to Camden and Archdeacon Rigney, soon to be made second Vicar General of the Archdiocese, took charge of St. Augustine's. Old timers long remembered how his parting sermon was accompanied by "much weeping and sobbing" and how when he climbed on board his gig for the long journey to the south the roadside was black with people waving him a sad farewell. But Balmain had not seen the last of him. He left his heart among its kindly loyal people and returned nine years later, as we shall presently see, to complete the work from which he had been called.

Unfortunately space will not permit of anything like a detailed account of his years in Camden. Such an account could scarcely fail to be interesting, if only for its stories of the hardships and privations of those early days in the Colony; of long and weary journeys through the unreclaimed bush in search of the lost sheep; and of sleepless nights spent in miserable huts or under the broad canopy of heaven. Let it be sufficient to say that his achievements were so extraordinary as to appear almost incredible. Of all the problems that confronted that far-flung, sparsely populated parish in the summer of 1869, easily the most important and most urgent was that of the little children. What of their Catholic education? Father Dillon was equal to the task. Not only did he maintain the few existing Catholic schools, such as they were, but at the end of three years he had dotted that vast area with no fewer than eighteen new ones, all reasonably equipped, efficiently manned, and most of them in receipt of some measure of Government assistance. Next to receive his attention were the churches. Within the space of a few years, two new ones were erected, and three already partly built were completed. As a crowning gesture, the tower of the principal church was raised by forty feet. This last was evidently too much for the former pastor, Archdeacon Rigney, who promptly announced his intention of immediately completing St. Patrick's, Parramatta, by the addition of a tower and steeple "that will be easily seen from Camden".

But no account, however brief, of Father Dillon's labours at Camden would be complete without some reference to his efforts on behalf of the poor aborigines. Time was, before the white man learnt to throw a road over the mountains, when Burragorang Valley was a blackman's paradise. Guarded on every side by towering crags shooting their purple peaks a thousand feet into the air, and with its grassy flats and running streams abounding in kangaroos, wallabies, fish, and

eels, it is little wonder that this delightful natural sanctuary, which tradition identifies with the "Terrible Hollow" of Rolf Boldrewood's *Robbery Under Arms*, early became and long remained a favourite hunting ground of many wandering tribes. But at the time of which we speak those tribes, or what remained of them, had become, in Father Dillon's words, "the veriest vagrants on that soil which was once all theirs". For them his heart was full of compassion, and some idea of his labours to win them over to Christianity and civilization may be had from the following extract from a most pathetic appeal which he issued on their behalf. After outlining some of the difficulties that had been successfully overcome, the circular proceeds: "The farm, purchased from a settler, together with the means of working it; and expenditure for rations, tools, carriage of materials, etc., while the tribe were engaged in constructing dwellings for their families and in cultivating the soil, has already cost about £500. Through the labour of the blacks alone it has yielded during the past year, about 300 bushels of corn and 150 bushels of wheat, besides a large quantity of potatoes and other vegetables; and what is best of all, it has largely contributed to withdraw the tribe from their nomadic habits and to teach them industrial pursuits, which, under direction, they follow with fair steadiness. A good schoolhouse, with teacher's residence, is built upon the farm, and adjoining it is the Church of St. Joseph, which is regularly visited from Camden, and serves both the aborigines and white settlers of the locality. To meet the present liability on this farm a sum of £310 has been subscribed. This falls short of the sum already expended by £190. As, however, the farm only contains seventy acres of land, of which one half is fit for cultivation, a further sum would be needed to give the tribe sufficient arable land to support themselves without the necessity of seeking to supplement their resources by labour among the whites—a continual source of demoralization to the men from the facility with which they get drunk when away. The many wants of the Camden district in 1869, as to educational means, forced me to establish schools in every part of the mission, and by 1871 eighteen of these schools were in operation. Of these, nine were situated in the district of Burragorang. Wherever the tribe wandered they were sure to meet a school, and I cannot bear too high a testimony to the anxiety of the teachers and the settlers to do all they could to attract the children to these schools. The female teachers, aided by respectable farmers' daughters, every Sunday visited the women in the camps and instructed them in religion. The Rosary was

recited round the camp fire every night. The children in a little while were able to instruct their parents better than the whites could. The result was that in 1874 all, with the exception of five, were baptized and prepared for the reception of the other Sacraments”.

Needless to say, the appeal met with a ready response, Protestants vying with Catholics in a friendly rivalry to help on the charitable work. As a result, Father Dillon was enabled to purchase much additional land and to stock it with a beautiful herd of Jersey cows generously donated by the dairying community of Camden. Better still, the project received the warm approval of Dr. Vaughan, whose own brother, the Bishop of Salford, had actually given a lead in this regard by founding some years previously the Missionary College of St. Joseph, Mill Hill, for the evangelization of the native races of America. When His Grace visited the valley in 1874 for the Blessing of the new Church of the Guardian Angels, he was met at Campbelltown by a great cavalcade of horsemen, with Father Dillon at their head, and escorted by easy stages to his destination. The descent was slow and precarious, but the welcome that awaited him was sufficient recompense. Helping to serve on the altar were two little blackboys neatly dressed in cassock and surplice, while a third read a beautiful address of welcome on behalf of the assembled tribes. So pleased was His Grace with everything he saw and heard that he warmly commended the project and obtained for it shortly afterwards the special Blessing of the Holy Father. And thus at last the long accepted belief that “you might as well set to work to whitewash the gum trees in the bush as to Christianize the blacks” was finally and completely shattered, but, as one of the leading papers of the time remarked, “it took a Father Dillon to do it”.

But building churches and schools were not Father Dillon's only occupations, and scarcely a month went by that he was not to be found in some large centre of New South Wales preaching a mission, conducting a retreat for the clergy, or delivering the occasional address at some important foundation ceremony. In 1876 he was entrusted by Bishop O'Quinn, of Brisbane, with a particularly difficult and delicate mission at Armidale, the result of which made glad the hearts of Catholic people throughout the Colony. For a time it seemed as if he might even wear the mitre, his name being freely mentioned as the likely successor of Bishop Shiel in the See of Adelaide.

On St. Patrick's Day, 1878, Father Dillon said his last Mass in Camden, and in a long and tender address took leave of his sorrowing

people black and white, before returning to Balmain. Among the reasons that impelled Archbishop Vaughan to recall him to the scene of his former labours, two may be of interest. One was connected with His Grace's desire to establish a new Catholic newspaper (of which more anon). The other was the result of a particularly clever move on the part of his old friends and admirers in Balmain. Realizing the urgent need of a new Sisters' school at Balmain West, as Rozelle was then called, a number of those good people formed themselves into a committee, purchased a suitable block of land and then, seizing their opportunity when the parish was vacant owing to the retirement of Dr. Forrest, offered it to the Archbishop with the request that the project be entrusted to Father Dillon.

Whether by accident or design, the Blessing of the foundation stone of the new school, which in Father Dillon's words was to "save the rising generation from the heavy misfortune of a soulless, Christianless and infidel education", took place in the fateful month of November, 1879, just as Sir Henry Parkes was about to introduce into Parliament the second reading of his long threatened Bill for the abolition of all State aid to denominational schools. The Archbishop's occasional address dealt at great length with the all-absorbing subject of the proposed amendment to the Education Act and aroused the bitterest resentment of Parkes and his associates by branding it as "the modern Scavenger's daughter". Having explained the *modus operandi* of the historical instrument of refined torture of Elizabethan days, in which the victim was gradually and almost imperceptibly crushed to death, he declared that the modern system of scientific persecution, as applied to Catholics, was far more disastrous and cruel than the systems of old, for whereas grown men and women were the only victims in days gone by, little children were now selected for these purposes.

Immediately the storm clouds began to gather in the political heavens and Parliament had no sooner assembled on the following Tuesday than Buchanan moved the adjournment of the House to discuss the Archbishop's speech at Balmain, which he brazenly described as seditious, inflammatory, and the speech of a firebrand. Day after day for weeks, tirades of abuse continued to be hurled at the Archbishop, and it is indicative of the extent to which the iron of persecution had entered the souls of our ancestors to find the Catholic Member for the Hunter River shamelessly declaring: "I do not like him a bit better than you do. I wish he had never come to this country". Indicative also of the

blind prejudice and fury that had been whipped up was the wild statement of a non-Catholic Member that the worst cargo of convicts that ever landed at Port Jackson had been less detrimental to the Colony than the arrival of Dr. Vaughan. One solitary Member, Mr. Daniel O'Connor, was found courageous enough to risk political extinction by standing up and boldly defending the good name of his illustrious Archbishop. If O'Connor's memory is not in benediction, it certainly ought to be.

In 1880 Archbishop Vaughan, annoyed by the *Freeman's* sponsoring of Home Rule, founded the *Express*, which, as might be expected, had a very short and troublesome career. The paper was to be controlled by a board consisting of Fathers Mahony, Dillon, Sheridan, and Leonard. J. F. Archibald was its first editor, and John Haynes his associate in the editor's chair. These two champions of orthodoxy, specially selected to mould Catholic opinion and guard the destinies of the Church in New South Wales, were in reality little interested in any religion, and looked upon their connection with "the priests' paper" as a practical joke. During the third week of the paper's existence Dean Leonard made a discovery which was immediately followed by the retirement of Haynes and Archibald. It seems that the two distinguished defenders of the Faith had set up the first number of the *Bulletin* in the *Express* office. Dean Leonard, an old printer himself, must have had some inkling of what was going on. He dropped in just in time and disposed of the first issue of the *Bulletin* by putting his foot through the type and kicking the metal about the floor. That first number of the *Bulletin*, decorated with a portrait of the hangman, was subsequently reset and printed elsewhere.

It is hardly necessary to add that in spite of strenuous efforts by Father Dillon the *Express* never seriously rivalled the *Freeman* and survived but a few years.

In October, 1881, after slightly more than twenty years of unremitting apostolic labours, Father Dillon finally severed his connection with Australia. Escorted for some distance by two launches filled with hundreds of his sorrowing parishioners, he sailed down the harbour and through the heads, destined in the inscrutable designs of Providence never to return. Medical advice to seek restoration of his failing health in a long vacation was the reason generally given for his departure, though many were of the opinion that his illness was more strategic than real and that the true cause was his reluctance to co-operate in the

establishment of a large boarding school which he felt convinced was not in the best interests of the parish.

In the spring of 1883 he visited Italy and while there was encouraged by the Irish Augustinian Fathers, with whom he stayed, to publish his celebrated work, *The Virgin Mother of Good Counsel*.¹ This remarkable book of almost seven hundred pages, which will always stand as the classical history in English of the Shrine at Genazzano and the Miraculous Picture of Our Lady of Good Counsel, not only received the highest commendations of eminent Prelates and theologians throughout the world, but was warmly praised by Pope Leo XIII himself who had it translated into Italian by the distinguished scholar Don Benedetto Mileto, just then famous for his fine translation of Cardinal Manning's *The Eternal Priesthood*. In the same year also a French edition appeared in Paris, the work of the Rev. Mother Prioress of the Benedictine Nuns at Ventnor.

In October, 1884, Father Dillon (now Monsignor and Doctor) delivered at Edinburgh a series of lectures which were afterwards published by Gill of Dublin under the title of *The War of Anti-Christ with The Church and Christian Civilization*,² and which deal chiefly with Freemasonry and other secret societies. Although long since out of print, this work is still regarded as a valuable source of information and is frequently referred to in Father Cahill's recent valuable book on the same subject.

Father Dillon's subsequent career is difficult to trace and we prefer to leave the task of telling the little that is known of it to the

¹*The Virgin Mother of Good Counsel: A history of the ancient Sanctuary of Our Lady of Good Counsel in Genazzano, and of the wonderful apparition and miraculous translation of Her Sacred Image from Scutari in Albania to Genazzano in 1467. With an appendix on the Miraculous Crucifix, San Pio, Roman Ecclesiastical Education, etc.*, Large Edition, Printed at the Propaganda Press, Rome, 1884. Imperial 8vo, 655 pages. Slightly abridged popular Edition by M. H. Gill, Dublin, 1885.

²*The War of Anti-Christ with the Church and Christian Civilization: A review of the rise and progress of Atheism; its extension through Voltaire; its use of Freemasonry and Kindred Secret Societies for Anti-Christian War; the union and "illumination" of masonry by Weishaupt; its progress under the leaders of the first French Revolution, and under Nubius, Palmerston, and Mazzini; the control of its hidden "inner circle" over all revolutionary organizations; its influence over British Freemasonry; its attempts upon Ireland; oaths, signs, and passwords of the three degrees, etc., etc.; the Spoliation of the Propaganda.* Dublin: M. H. Gill; London and New York: Burns & Oates. 1885. Pages XXIV + 240, 8vo.

The whole profits from the sales of both books, which were very considerable, were given over by Fr. Dillon to Monsignor Kirby, Rector of the Irish College, Rome, for the benefit of the suffering Nuns in Italy who had been despoiled of all their property by the Italian Government.

venerable Monsignor Flanagan, of Mudgee, who, as a boy at Orange, and later as a student and young priest in Rome, knew and admired this grand old warrior of the past, this central figure and often stormy petrel of so many of Australia's "old unhappy far off things and battles long ago".

This is what Monsignor Flanagan has to say: "In the seventies I remember listening to a sermon from Father Dillon on some particular occasion in Orange. He had an agreeable manner, and the sermon was long, and he had a very red head. If I remember correctly, he was at that time Pastor at Camden. Also he was one of the few who used to be asked to preach on great occasions in town or country before there were Regulars in N.S.W., except Benedictines. I don't remember hearing of him again until 1884. At that time I was a student at the Irish College in Rome... I was ordained in 1887 and remained in the College for a year or so afterwards. Consequently I met a lot of interesting people from all parts of the world. On one Sunday in particular, who should be there but Sir Patrick Jennings and Monsignor Dillon. The latter had been in Rome for some time. He had grown quite a handsome man. His red hair had become quite beautifully white and his manner most gracious. Sir Patrick had just arrived from Sydney after having been Premier of N.S.W. for some time. He was defeated by Parkes. Sir Patrick and Dillon had of course met before and the conversation that day was nearly all about Parkes and Sydney, and Parkes of course got a terrible showing up. Dillon was repeating again and again, "Yes, I was his first victim; I was his first victim"... I remember hearing that Dillon took a small residence for himself, that he had a piano in his house, and that he was subject to severe attacks of melancholia. I have an idea that he died in 1889 or thereabouts. I do not wonder at his not lasting long. Rome to a man like Dillon not knowing the language and not making friends late in life is a very lonely place."

In Balmain the periodical use of a beautiful set of cloth-of-gold vestments never fails to awaken in the hearts of old and devoted parishioners many golden memories of the golden-haired, golden-voiced kindly priest who first bequeathed those sacred vestments as a memorial of his love for St. Augustine's more than sixty golden years ago. Requiescat in Pace.

R. WYNNE.

St. Thomas's World and His "Ways"

Summary: The five famous proofs of God's existence called *ways* are open to various interpretations. Since they start from features of the visible world they may in some cases be coloured by St. Thomas's cosmic theory.

In his proof from contingency, St. Thomas envisaged a class of *necessary* beings in nature. Modern apologists pass directly from the contingent to the absolutely necessary being. Failure to rise above the contingent leads to absurdity.

Concerning the proof from motion—(i) the starting-point is more extensive than local motion, but less wide than the so-called metaphysical motion; (ii) in supporting it, St. Thomas had recourse to Aristotelian physics, but when this is disregarded the proof remains valid and apodictic.

Five *ways* by which human reason may arrive at a knowledge of God are sketched by St. Thomas in the second question of his *Summa Theologiae*. Their general plan is uniform. Each of these rational roads starts from an observed fact and is traversed in two stages, represented by propositions to this effect: (1) Whatever is like the fact under consideration, is so only through dependence on something else; and (2) if this other thing be in a similar state of dependence, it and any number of its kind are insufficient to account ultimately for the fact. The conclusion is that, to account for the fact, there must be a cause of a higher kind, dependent on none, an uncaused cause. Thus the *ways* terminate in a knowledge of the First Cause under the special aspects suggested by the respective starting-points, to be expanded in subsequent questions of the *Summa* into a fuller recognition of the divine perfections.

The first *way* proceeds from motion to an unmoved mover; the second, from efficient causation to the first cause; the third, from "the possible and the necessary" to the *per se* necessary being; the fourth, from the degrees of perfection found in mundane things to the pure subsisting perfection; and the fifth, from purposive direction in nature to an intelligent governor of the world.

Some of these *ways* admit of various interpretations. Each rival interpretation may be in itself a valid proof, but only one can accord with St. Thomas's meaning. For example, the starting-point of the second—"ex ratione causae efficientis"—was taken by the late Fr. E. Hugon, O.P., to be "the activity of creatures", whereas his distinguished confrere, Fr. R. Garrigou-Lagrange, interprets it as "permanent and dependent existences". The moral of this remark is that in waters where big fish freely play, minnows may claim some liberty, too.

An article in the April *Record* described Aquinas's view of the universe and its vast difference from ours. That view has a real bearing on his proofs for the existence of God, for these start from particular features of the world. Especially in regard to two *ways*, the first and the third, is the Aristotelico-Thomist physics relevant. The exact manner in which St. Thomas understood them may not be the same as that in which they are used to-day.

We begin with the easier, the third *way*, commonly called the proof from contingency. The well-known proof, perhaps the most satisfactory of all, is presented thus—without any claim to interpret St. Thomas—by Fr. G. H. Joyce, S.J., in his “Principles of Natural Theology”:—

“Experience shows us that contingent beings exist. We see things come into existence and pass out of it. Animals and plants have their period of life and then die. Inanimate substances enter into composition, forming a new substance with properties different from those of its constituents; and after a time the compound is again resolved into its original elements. Now the existence of contingent beings involves the existence of necessary being, and is inexplicable without it. Therefore a necessary being exists: and this necessary being can be none other than a personal God.”

St. Thomas constructs the proof differently. He does not pass at once from contingent beings—called by him “*possibilia esse et non esse*”—to the *per se* necessary Being, but takes account of an intermediate class of beings called necessary, but which owe their necessity to another being (God). Thus he distinguishes, in all, three classes: the contingent, the necessary with derived necessity, and the *per se* necessary. Need we say the intermediate class consisted of the unalterable imperishable heavenly bodies—the “planets” and the fixed stars, with their conveyant spheres? Although St. Thomas did not go so far as to agree with Aristotle that the heavens existed eternally—for the faith taught otherwise—he held that, once made, they were not subject to the possibility of non-existence and in that sense they were eternal and necessary.

Thus the saint could write in his Commentary on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*: “He therefore states, as was said above, that there are three substances, and of these two are natural, because subject to motion: the one eternal, the heaven, and the other perishable, as plants and animals; and besides these two there is the third, which is immovable and therefore not natural” (*In Metaph.* XII, lect. 5). These are the three classes contemplated in the *tertia via*: the perishable, the necessary creatures, and God.

He declares explicitly in the *Contra Gentiles* that besides contingent created things there are others which are “*simpliciter et absolute*” neces-

sary. "Some things have been so made by God that there is in their nature a potentiality to non-existence because of the fact that their matter is in potency to another form. But those things that have not matter" (spiritual substances) "or that have it without potency to another Form" (celestial bodies) "are all devoid of potency to non-existence. These, therefore, exist of absolute and simple necessity" (C.G. II, 30).

Returning to the *Summa Theologiae*, there can be no doubt about what St. Thomas means when he writes in the second stage of the *tertia via*: "Therefore, not all beings are contingent, but some must be necessary among existing beings. Now every necessary being either does or does not derive its necessity from something else. But it is impossible to proceed to infinity with necessary beings whose necessity is caused—as was found also in the case of efficient causes. Therefore it is needful to posit something *per se* necessary, that does not derive its necessity from without and that causes the necessity which is in others. This Being all call God" (S.T. 1, 2, 3).

It must be remembered that St. Thomas held a *causal nexus* existed between contingent and necessary beings in nature, for he thought that the movements of the heavens caused the *generatio-corruptio*—coming into and passing out of existence—which the third way assigns as the mark of contingency in earthly things.

Incidentally, it is now better understood why "the necessary" is included in the title, "ex possibili et necessario", for the supposed necessary beings in creation also provide the argument, which is from the possible *and* the necessary to God. In a somewhat similar fashion, the second way is not just from efficient causes, but from the subordination of one to another above it, and so on.

Nowadays we by-pass the necessary beings in nature and use an argument that is in substance, thought not in form, the same. Possibly, St. Thomas's hypothesis might be turned against the materialistic assumption that matter in general, as distinguished from its transient adaptations, is necessary. If some necessity be attributed to matter, it can be no more than relative necessity, which is insufficient to account for itself, and thus St. Thomas's reasoning is applicable to it.

Jean-Paul Sartre finds contingency a most impressive characteristic of existing things, investing them with impenetrable mystery. He refuses to accept the only explanation of contingent existence, namely, a necessary Being, and thus he is left with the alternative,

which he erects into a principle, that all things are inherently *absurd*. This incongruous choice, with all the chaotic consequences he draws from it, only stresses the rationality of the Theistic affirmation and, in particular, of the proof from contingent being to the Necessary.

The other *way* affected by St. Thomas's cosmic theory is the first: "*ex parte motus*". Motion here means, we believe, not *all* change, on the one hand, nor solely local motion, on the other, but all four kinds of transition distinguished in corporeal things and called by St. Thomas motion "*in the proper sense*".

The saint calls this the more obvious *way*, "*manifestior via*", and the description at once creates a presumption that he means motion that is seen. So-called metaphysical motion, that is, any transition from potency to act, including thought and volition, is held by some weighty authorities like Garrigou-Lagrange to be the starting-point of the first way. (Cf. *Dieu: son existence et sa Nature*.) After accepting this exegesis for many years, one is permitted to depart from it now. To do so is not to deny what the veteran Thomist is at pains to uphold, that God is the First Mover in all created activity, but merely to keep within corporeal limits the kind of activity St. Thomas here intended. In other words, when St. Thomas wrote the words "*ex parte motus*" we believe he meant only motion in the *visible world*. There follows at once his explanatory sentence: "*Certum enim est, et sensu constat, aliqua moveri in hoc mundo*". Motion sensibly perceived is thus identical with the motion intended and not just an example of it.

In the *Contra Gentiles*, the same fact is stated thus: "*Patet autem sensu aliquid moveri, ut puta solem*". Any sensibly evident motion is the starting-point; the sun's motion is the example. Since the *Contra Gentiles* expounds at length the *way* which the *Summa Theologiae* states only summarily, it is natural to interpret the latter with the aid of the former. In both works the argument is expressed in the same two propositions: (1) "Everything that is in motion is being moved by something else"; and (2) "There is no going to infinity with things that both give motion and are in motion". In proving the first proposition, St. Thomas expressly says that Aristotle, whose proof he is professedly setting forth, understood motion "*proprie*", as "*actus existentis in potentia secundum quod hujusmodi, qualiter non est nisi divisibilium et corporum*". Similarly, in proving the second proposition he repeats and stresses that he is referring all along to bodies: "*Quum ergo omnia praedicta moventia et mota sint corpora*". What could be clearer?

Turning aside to Aristotle's Third Book of *Physics*, we find the celebrated definition of motion followed by an enlightening enumeration of what it applies to. Here are the decisive words: "*The actualization of what exists potentially in so far as it exists potentially, is motion—namely, of what is alterable 'qua' alterable, alteration; of what can be increased and its opposite what can be decreased, increase and decrease; of what can come to be and pass away, coming to be and passing away; of what can be carried along, locomotion*" (Phys. III, 1; 201a, 10). What Aristotle meant by motion, and what St. Thomas meant, is the fourfold motion peculiar to material things: *alteratio, augmentatio, generatio, latio*.

In terrestrial bodies all four forms of motion are found, but in heavenly bodies only local motion—so the theory runs—and all the terrestrial motions are *caused* by the heavenly. "The heavenly body is therefore the cause of all alteration in things that alter. But in terrestrial things alteration is the source of all (other) motion, for through it both 'increase' and 'generation' are brought about, and the generant is the *per se* mover in the local movement of what is light and heavy" (C.G. III, 82). If, then, the motion we witness is not that of a heavenly body, it is in any case caused by a heavenly body.

To proceed further, the movement of the lower spheres is caused by intelligences as well as by the first moved sphere, and the movement of this *primum mobile* is caused immediately by God. The heavens moved by the intelligences united to them were said to be self-moved, but even that movement is caused by God in so far as he is the object of desire. "Since God is not part of a self-mover, Aristotle traces—from the mover that is part of a self-mover—another mover, altogether distinct, who is God. For as every self-mover moves because of desire, it follows that the mover who is part of a self-mover moves because of a desire for something desirable that is superior to him in regard to motion; but the desired is an entirely unmoved mover. Hence there must be a first mover who is separate and perfectly free from motion—who is God" (C.G. I, 13). The casual connection which undoubtedly exists between motion and God was understood by St. Thomas in accordance with the cosmic system of Aristotle, and no one to-day would prove the argument from motion on the lines of the chapter just quoted from the *Contra Gentiles*. Father Joseph Rickaby, S.J., in making his abridged version of that work, under the title, "God and His Creatures", refrained from

translating most of the chapter, based, as he said it was, "upon the treacherous foundation of Aristotelian Physics".

Yet no particular system of physics is essential for its validity, and the proof proper is distinct from the theory that St. Thomas applied to it. Although the starting-point is a physical fact, the proof itself is metaphysical. The conclusion does not rest on induction, or an examination of various instances, but on a metaphysical analysis of what is entailed in even one instance of motion. The starting-point is certain, through the testimony of the senses; the two propositions in the argument are metaphysically certain; and the resulting conclusion is metaphysically certain.

The atheist is one who fails to rise above the creature-level. What Thomists call the analogy of being means nothing to him. How often the "God" he rejects is a gross misconception, a magnified creature, we do not know. A contemporary philosopher says he cannot believe in a God who is a cause of himself—showing he does not grasp the true meaning of God—and he sticks in the contingent. More doughty philosophers, like Bergson, have been so fascinated by another condition of creatures, change, or becoming, as to identify it with existence. It is true that in all objects of human experience nothing is completely stable: all things are continuously undergoing change of some kind. But change, like a shadow, denotes something greater. St. Thomas analysed the transition entailed in physical motion, but the analysis might be extended to all change, whatsoever, showing how it points to the immutable God, of whom Boetius wrote: "*stabilisque manens das cuncta moveri*".

If, no longer accepting the sublime astronomy of Aristotle and St. Thomas, we may not speak in the same sense of "the Love that moves the sun and other stars", it remains true, as the fifth *way* supplements the first in showing, that Divine Love does move creation, all the same.

CORNELIUS ROBERTS.

Bishop Willson, V.

NORFOLK ISLAND CHAPLAINS.

Summary: Religious state of Norfolk Island—Dr. Ullathorne advocates the appointment of a Catholic Chaplain—Secretary of State approves the plan—Father McEncroe and Dr. Gregory reach Norfolk Island (1838)—Work on island—Return to Sydney of Dr. Gregory, and, later, of Fr. McEncroe (1841)—Fr. R. Walsh becomes chaplain—Fr. McGrath appointed as second chaplain—McGrath and Walsh replaced by Kavanagh and Keating (1845)—Fr. Murray replaces Fr. Keating—Dr. Willson learns of Fr. Kavanagh's dispute with authorities—Arrival of Fr. Rigney (1846)—Government objects to Rigney—Dr. Gregory's view of situation—Dr. Willson writes to Dr. Polding—Arrival of Fr. M. Ryan to assist Fr. Murray (1848)—Government wishes to reduce number of chaplains—Willson's letter on subject—Fr. Murray leaves island (1850)—Character of Fr. Ryan—He is only priest on island for 15 months—Willson's distress—Fr. T. Lucas volunteers—Norfolk Island comes under Dr. Willson's jurisdiction—End of penal settlement—Norfolk Island again under Sydney's jurisdiction (1856).

In 1834 Judge Burton of New South Wales was commissioned to go to Norfolk Island for the trial of thirty men implicated in a cunningly devised plot to seize arms and other military equipment. Certain it was that several of the accused would be sentenced to death. Some of these were Catholics in whose souls the spark of divine faith, notwithstanding years of spiritual starvation, had not been completely extinguished. The Judge relates a touching incident. One of the condemned outlaws "broke out into the most passionate exclamations and entreaties that he might not die without the benefit of Confession. 'As you hope to be saved yourself' he said, 'do not let me die without seeing my priest'. Poor soul! He was a Roman Catholic, and after this he was taken away to his cell and in miserable agony employed his time embracing and beating himself upon a rudely constructed figure of a Cross which a fellow-prisoner of the same persuasion made for him of wood; and incoherently and madly pronounced incessantly those brief exclamations for mercy which such a one could teach him".

Not in vain had the sinner lifted up his voice: his prayer of humility pierced the clouds. Into his cell walked a priest. It was the Rev. William Ullathorne, who had come to prepare the Catholics to face another tribunal. On his rounds he interviewed several men urgently in need of fatherly advice and kindly guidance. To some he brought the tidings that a reprieve would be granted. This assurance excited no emotion of cheerfulness: rather did tears of anger and distress lay bare the thoughts of disappointed souls. Those who were not to die actually envied their comrades for whom the hour of deliverance was about to

strike. Of thirteen men whose sentences were not to be reviewed three professed themselves Catholics; four others begged for and received Father Ullathorne's ministrations; while yet another four consigned to the gallows by an earlier judicial decision joined the little group of penitents. Not one of them expressed regret at the prospect of being delivered by the hand of the executioner from the bitterness of that foul island "full, as it was, of crimes against God and man, murders and blasphemies and all uncleanness".

Forced to witness the final scene two thousand closely guarded men stood in grim silence around the platform of tragedy. For similar spectacles they had been assembled often before: they would be so again. But this morning there was a feature new and certainly striking: the charity of Christ was playing a part. Accompanied by their priest the Catholics joined in the recitation of contrite and confident prayers until the signal was given for the drawing of the gruesome bolt. Without delay the bodies were rushed off to the common grave in the cemetery. Having read the prayers prescribed by the Ritual the priest fixed his eyes on a lonely little cross marking the burial-place of a Highland officer's child. It bore the pathetic inscription: 'Far from the land of his fathers'. Of all who up to that moment had been laid to rest on Norfolk Island he alone had passed through the gates of death without the intervention of a judge or the assassin.

A week of apostolic toil amongst the Catholic prisoners bore rich fruits of grace and hope. At the Settlement 150 received Holy Communion. A score of Protestants came to be instructed in the Faith. These well-disposed children of God were not to be left altogether without succour: a catechist was chosen, with official approval, to work amongst them, to recite daily prayers, and to conduct religious exercises on Sundays. Early training with a good education had eminently furnished this youth with the knowledge and ability to carry out the duties allotted to him by Father Ullathorne. Results proved the worth of this experiment in Catholic Action. When the New South Wales Vicar-General next called at Norfolk Island, on his way to England in 1836, he was told that his congregation had persevered in the way of rectitude, not one of them having been guilty in the fifteen months interval of a punishable offence. On this occasion as many as 300 joyously accepted the opportunity to receive the Sacraments while twelve more made a profession of submission to the Church.

Before Dr. Ullathorne came back to Australia the Imperial Govern-

ment, moved by his advocacy and by reports from Bishop Polding, had consented to support a Catholic Chaplain, or Religious Instructor, for the penal station of Norfolk Island. For this particular charge the Secretary of State approved of the selection of the Rev. John Brady. Dr. Polding, however, thought it better to employ his priest in New South Wales and with the consent of the Government to entrust the care of the Island to Father John McEncroe "as being better adapted by his Colonial experience" for the hardships of that trying mission. Unwilling to leave one priest isolated on the distant speck of land the Bishop asked the Rev. H. G. Gregory, O.S.B., to share the exile of his friend. This was in October, 1838. The earliest accounts received by the Bishop told a cheerful story: "Messrs. McEncroe and Gregory have written from Norfolk Island. They reached there after a tedious navigation of 17 days. They propose building a church. They have obtained a place of separate interment for the Catholics, and a garden in the most beautiful part of the Island".

There was another garden in dire need of cultivation; to this the two priests directed their undivided attention. Somewhat estranged from their mother, the Church, straying sheep to the number of 450 had to be gathered in for the Good Shepherd. Each day brought its trials and its compensations. At the bedside of the sick, in the solitary confinement cells, amongst the labour-gangs—everywhere the Chaplains were to be seen. The men learned to love them, to give them confidences, to listen to their admonitions, and to accept in better spirit life's burdens as an expiation and atonement for sin. Most of the felons were good at heart. Father McEncroe did not hesitate to declare publicly that he preferred the company of the most degraded amongst them to that of some governing officials.

After a year the Rev. H. G. Gregory returned to Sydney, leaving his colleague working for a time in splendid isolation. Father McEncroe did not lose his cheerfulness. Anxious moments he had: with such a flock that was to be expected. Prayer, and study and pastoral duties filled up the hours, the weeks, and the months. He built a modest chapel dedicated to Saint Vincent of Paula, and there he could discuss all his worries with an understanding Friend. God visibly blessed his labours. "I continue to hear most satisfactory accounts from Norfolk Island", wrote Dr. Polding, "where an astonishing change has taken place". Unhappily no change, except for the worse, could be effected in the prevailing official attitude towards crime and its preven-

tion. On this subject the temporal and the spiritual powers never succeeded in reaching an agreement.

In 1841, as the Rev. J. McEncroe's services could be no longer dispensed with in Sydney, the duties of Chaplain were undertaken by the Rev. Richard Walsh. Owing to the unwillingness of other Colonies to receive any more transported prisoners Catholics were increasing in number, so much so that the Government agreed to grant recognition to a second Chaplain at Norfolk Island. Father McGrath was the priest selected. Thus it happened that there were two Chaplains in office at the date of Bishop Willson's consecration. Though the Island had been transferred to the civil jurisdiction of Van Diemen's Land its spiritual ruler remained as heretofore the Archbishop of Sydney, who insisted on regarding the two Chaplains as his subjects to be appointed or removed as he deemed desirable. The Bishop of Hobart was, in fact, Dr. Polding's Vicar-General. Such an arrangement was not to Dr. Willson's liking: it became less so as time went by. Neither did the Lieutenant-Governor of Van Diemen's Land recognise its existence in reference to questions in which were involved the rights of the civil power. The first signs of friction appeared in 1845 when Fathers Walsh and McGrath were recalled to Sydney and two other priests were sent by the Archbishop to fill the vacancies. When he got Bishop Willson's request for approval the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir J. E. Eardley Wilmot, hesitated to sanction the new appointments. The letter which closed the resultant correspondence will explain the situation.

"Comptroller-General's Office,

"17th July, 1845.

"Sir,

"I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 5th instant in reply to my letter of the 21st ult., in which you were informed that before His Excellency could take into consideration the question of the appointment of the Rev. Messrs. Kavanagh and Keating as successors to the Rev. Messrs. Walsh and McGrath as Roman Catholic Religious Instructors at Norfolk Island it would be required that His Excellency should be furnished with information showing whether the Rev. Messrs. Walsh and McGrath resigned their appointments or whether they were removed.

"In your present letter you state that it was within your own knowledge that Messrs. Walsh and McGrath were removed at their

own earnest request; and I am now instructed to acquaint you that however irregular their removal and relief have been, yet that in consideration of the inconvenience which Messrs. Kavanagh and Keating would sustain, as also the detriment to the service that would be caused by the absence for a time of any Roman Catholic Instructor were His Excellency to withhold his approval of their appointment, His Excellency has been pleased to sanction upon your recommendation their becoming the successors to Messrs. Walsh and McGrath.

"I am, however, to add that the Civil Commandant has been informed for his future guidance that he is not authorised to recognise the appointment of any person of which he does not receive a due notification either from His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor through this office, or from the Right Honourable the Secretary of State, and further that he has been instructed to acquaint Messrs. Kavanagh and Keating that any application they may wish to prefer either for removal, leave of absence, or any other matter connected with their appointment must be addressed through him to this office for the Lieutenant-Governor's consideration. I have the honour, etc.,

"M. FORSTER".

With his mind at ease concerning the spiritual needs of Norfolk Island the Archbishop of Sydney sailed for England and Rome. Not for long did his arrangements hold. Serious illness forced one of the Chaplains, the Rev. Jerome Keating, to seek medical advice in New South Wales. The physicians warned him that it would be fatal to resume duties in the Penal Department. Unwilling to leave the whole burden to Father John Kavanagh longer than absolutely necessary, Dr. Willson invited the Archbishop's Vicar-General to nominate another of his clergy. The choice fell upon the Rev. Thomas Joseph Murray, a retired military officer, recently ordained in the Order of Saint Benedict. Crossing over to Hobart the aged priest—he was now in his 63rd year—obtained from the Bishop the required recommendation to the Lieutenant-Governor. On April 2nd, 1846, he left for his remote retreat. Once more there were two Chaplains representing the Church in that gloomy region of rebellious and forsaken souls.

Peace had not yet smiled on Norfolk Island. In May, 1846, Bishop Willson himself landed there. Following a careful investigation of every feature of prison life he drew the Commandant's attention to several evils of serious magnitude. He learned, too, that all was not well in his own particular department. The ruffled officials

were able to say: 'Remove the beam from your own eye'. To the Secretary of State there had been forwarded a Report which might lend colour to the suspicion that the Bishop had put forward for appointment men not properly qualified for the service of the convicts. The Rev. J. Kavanagh, it was said, had completely failed to satisfy the regulations regarding daily prayers, visitation of the infirmaries and cells, and other kindred duties. On being questioned about his alleged negligence the Chaplain asserted that the hospital rules "did not admit of seeing Catholics separately"; that he had followed the routine introduced by his predecessors; and that he had done all that his ecclesiastical superiors required. As a result of his enquiries Dr. Willson felt satisfied that some cause for complaint existed and that it would not be possible for the reprovved Chaplain to work in harmony with the governing authorities any longer. He therefore wrote to Sydney requesting that a change should be made. In the absence of the Archbishop it was Dr. Gregory who had to determine what action should be taken. Writing to him on July 2nd, in the Bishop's name, the Hobart Vicar-General said: "To-morrow the *Franklin* sails for Norfolk Island. Mr. Kavanagh will be advised to *resign* his office and return to Sydney by the *Franklin*, which will be in about six weeks. You will be pleased therefore to provide such a successor as the Bishop with confidence can recommend".

Before Sydney could make the next move Bishop Willson was forced to ask one of his own priests to proceed on an urgent mission to Norfolk Island. The reason was this: a crisis arose with which Father Murray had not the courage to cope. What happened? In one of the Bishop's letters the facts are given: "In July the dreadful murder took place at Norfolk Island for which twelve men in one morning suffered death, and five on another occasion. On the heart-rending petition of poor Mr. Murray (the priest on the Island) and with my mind agonised with the state of spiritual destitution of that ill-fated spot I begged of the Rev. Mr. Bond to the great loss of religion in the Penal Settlement [Port Arthur] where he served so successfully and meritoriously to proceed to Norfolk Island".

Having discharged the special duties for which he had been appointed Father William Bond naturally returned to his own Station in Van Diemen's Land. Then there came the good news that Dr. Gregory had found a priest willing to join Father Murray whose distress signals were numerous and earnest. The new Chaplain was the Rev.

John Rigney, who was despatched to Hobart in September, 1846, just at the time the Bishop was setting out for Europe. All formalities for the passage to Norfolk Island had been completed when the Comptroller-General informed Father Hall, the Vicar-General, that the Lieutenant-Governor objected to ratify his choice of Chaplain. What was the origin of this unexpected and irritating crisis? On reading the printed regulations handed to all Government servants the Rev. J. Rigney was fired with indignation. He would not be dictated to by any authority other than that to which he had vowed obedience: never would he allow Caesar to usurp the power that belonged to God. His letters to the Department were considered to be sufficient evidence in themselves that he had not the wish to co-operate with the Government. There appeared to be only one course open—to ask Sydney to find another priest. That is what Father Hall did.

As Dr. Gregory was away touring the rural areas of New South Wales the first reply to the Hobart Vicar-General's communication came from Father John McEncroe:—

"I strongly recommend you to retain Mr. Rigney in Van Diemen's Land: for it does not matter whether he be employed at Hobart Town or at Norfolk Island—that is provided you supply his place. The Rev. Mr. Bond seems to have been very happy in his management, both with the Government and the prisoners: perhaps you might make an exchange. If Mr. Rigney has not yet left for Sydney I respectfully suggest that you retain him till at least you hear from Dr. Gregory: for, I fear we shall not be able to spare another so well qualified from this country....If you should succeed in obtaining another appointment for Mr. Rigney you had better advise him to be more guarded in his language towards those Government officials".

The regulations governing the conduct of Chaplains in Van Diemen's Land differed in nothing from those in force at Norfolk Island. It was, therefore, out of the question to retain the services of the Rev. J. Rigney: he went back to Sydney. Dr. Gregory had no other missionary to offer: in truth he was not disposed to ask any of his priests to submit to the conditions laid down by the heads of the Penal Department. He summed up the position in a note to Father Hall:—

"Sydney,

"April 23rd, 1847.

"My dear Confrere,

"I do not know what excuse to make for not having written you

ere now upon the subject of Norfolk Island. Your kind heart must plead for me. You have heard from Dean McEncroe that we had not a priest to succeed Mr. Rigney; but even if we had, I could not under existing circumstances with the Government appoint another. I suspect we shall soon have notice of a transfer of jurisdiction so that it is very probable you will have the undivided care of that much favored Island. Recent letters from His Grace tell me that the Home Government are indignant that the Chaplains to the convicts should have been degraded to the rank of mere Instructors—henceforward they are to be known as Priests. Earl Grey told Dr. Polding that Sir Eardley Wilmot had done wrong in refusing to sanction my appointment of Messrs. Kavanagh and Keating to Norfolk Island, for it was not the intention of the Government to interfere with the liberty of ecclesiastical discipline. You will, of course, soon learn all these things; for, I believe, official notice will be given of this return to the former and proper state of things. No priest could conscientiously submit to the directions contained in the printed schedule which was handed to Mr. Rigney for his guidance. I am, however, very sorry he wrote those very puerile letters to the Government: by so doing he has, I fear, spoiled a very good cause. I have written to Father Joseph [Murray] to tell him that if he requires a Confessarius he must get leave of absence for a short time and carry his load to Hobarton. I have moreover intimated to him that it is probable he may in a short time be finally relieved from his present arduous charge... Bishop Willson has not arrived [in England] when last I heard from Europe. The Archbishop sails on his return [to Sydney] about this time. Ambrose [Cotham] is very idle. He never writes a word to us.

"With kindest regards to all confreres,

"Believe me, most affectionately,

"H. G. GREGORY".

In Rome the two Australian churchmen had met and had discussed amongst other questions the affairs of Norfolk Island: an agreement about future policy was the outcome. But Dr. Polding, on learning what had happened in his absence, decided to make no move towards providing a second Chaplain. Weighing the facts of Father Kavanagh's "resignation" and of Father Rigney's attitude towards the Government he arrived at the conclusion that some of the charges brought against the first named priest were without solid foundation, and the latter had followed the correct course in resisting improper interference by the

civil power. In replying to a statement from Father Hall drawing attention to Norfolk Island's plight he wrote:

"SYDNEY, April 12th, 1848.

"My dear and Rev. Sir,

"By some unaccountable delay or negligence your favour of the 22nd March only reached me yesterday. Respecting Norfolk Island, Earl Grey at one time signified to me the intention of Government to be its total abandonment. Mr. Hawes on another occasion mentioned the probability of its being attached to N. South Wales. In this uncertainty as to its fate the Island remains in *statu quo*. One missionary cannot permanently be left there alone. As Govt. proposes to allow one stipend—I presume £200 or £250 per annum—this can be made the means of support to two as was the case in the time of Mr. McEncroe and Dr. Gregory. The School-master might be a Catechist, living with the missionaries, and thus by studying economy, all might be very comfortably supported. Then Father Joseph Murray might remain as second Chaplain—and though his infirmities might unfit him for much active duty, he could hear the Confession of the other missionary, and fulfill portion of the sacred ministry. This plan I could wish to be carried out. If for the present you could send one from V. Diemen's Land, it would be a considerable relief to this diocese. I am called upon to assist to the utmost the recently formed diocese of Melbourne... whatever powers or authority may be required I hereby impart to you..

"J. B. POLDING".

Bishop Willson was back in his diocese by the time this letter reached his Vicar-General. At once he re-opened the controversy—for such it may be described—concerning the Chaplains, his own limited and uncertain powers, and the unfitness of Father Murray to deal with the situation at Norfolk Island. In reply, Dr. Polding said:—

"I see no good likely to arise from the discussion respecting Norfolk Island in the past. Briefly animadverting on some points in reference to it I observe that having, as I mention in my last, an impression on my mind in common with Mr. McEncroe that in requesting Your Lordship to discharge the duties of Vicar-General over Norfolk Island I had communicated all authority for the purpose, it was natural I should not say anything of the kind in succeeding communications. As regards Mr. Rigney the cause of his not proceeding to Norfolk Island arose from his very improper style of correspondence with the Government. If Mr. Hall were privy to this correspondence I think blame attaches

to him for allowing it to pass through his office. With us no clergyman corresponds directly with the Government.

"Your Lordship will bear with me if I am not prepared to rest the truth of our Holy Religion on a point respecting which good men may hold different opinions, and be blameless. Calmly considering all the circumstances about Norfolk Island, and having the description St. Paul gives of charity in my mind, I can bring myself more readily to acquit parties than to pronounce judgment. To abstain from judging unto condemnation, we are assured by high authority, is one means to render judgment lenient in our own regard.

"I perused the extract from the Comptroller-General's letter, and perused it with pain, for it exhibits practice at variance with the first principles of Church government—an illustration of that Erastianism against which I advised head to be made so soon as I was informed of its existence. Rather than allow any civil officer to assume and exercise authority, and to render himself the immediate superior of the missionary, I say plainly I should leave the Island without a priest. Had I been there as missionary I trust with the grace of God I would not have neglected my duty; but unless the definite explicit regulations to which the Comptroller refers came to me through Your Lordship, or through the Vicar-General, I would deliberately and from principle have disregarded them. I do not see in the extract evidence of a neglect of missionary duty, sufficient to justify the remarks made—it may have existed—but I see lamentable proof of a degrading vilifying Church enslaving principle reduced to action; which, whatever good it may seem to work, is essentially evil—the parent of schism and of spiritual ruin. It is, in fact, that same Erastianism which is now bringing about the destruction of the Church of England".

What were the Regulations which caused all the excitement? Only three of them had reference to the Chaplains:—

26.) "Divine Service will be performed in the Morning and Afternoon of every Sunday, Christmas Day, and Good Friday, when the whole of the officers and convicts on the Settlement, who can be spared from immediate duty, will be required to attend. In the event of the absence of a Clergyman the Service will be performed by the Superintendent, or other person appointed by the Commandant. At each Gang Station there will also be Voluntary Sunday Schools, under the direction of the respective Religious Instructors.

27.) "There will be Daily Schools from six to eight o'clock, p.m.,

under the care of the Religious Instructors at the several Stations at which the fundamental parts only of education are to be taught the ignorant; Monitors being chosen from among the better informed of the Convicts.

28.) "The Religious Instructors will read Morning and Evening Prayers to the Convicts of the several Gangs, who are to be assembled for that purpose. They will also visit daily all Convicts in Hospital, and in solitary or separate confinement".

Up to this period the Regulations had caused no serious discontent. Perhaps Father Rigney had objected to the channel through which they were delivered rather than to anything contained in the text. It must be remembered that Norfolk Island was a prison where a fixed schedule of duties was not only reasonable but indispensable; that rules had to be couched in terms applicable to all denominations; that the Government which supplied a Chaplain's Salary was entitled to demand something in return; and that Dr. Willson himself required from his priests all that the Regulations specified, and much more. It should be taken into account, too, that no Catholic Chaplain was ever appointed without the Bishop's approval, or removed from a Station without his consent. In the case of the Rev. J. Kavanagh the Comptroller-General had appealed to Dr. Willson, "suggesting the propriety of a change". The evils apprehended by the Archbishop were more imaginary than real. In theory the Comptroller-General had some control over the Chaplains: in practice his authority touched nothing of spiritual significance. That is how the Bishop viewed the matter. His comment on Dr. Polding's stinging reprimand was expressed by three notes of exclamation—!!!

The Bishop's perseverance in pressing his claim for assistance was at length rewarded. A newly-ordained priest, Father Michael Harrington Ryan, was chosen as Assistant Chaplain for Norfolk Island. In a letter, dated September 16, 1848, the Archbishop had good news to impart: "By the vessel of which I made mention Mr. Ryan took his departure for the Island, and before this I trust he has reached his destination. Having already stated my opinion of Mr. Ryan I shall only add that he was selected because he appeared excellently qualified for the mission".

For a time, at least, the little ecclesiastical world of Norfolk Island caused no worry to Bishop Willson. He was there again in 1849 encouraging the Chaplains to face their uninviting task with cour-

age, and continuing his hard battle for justice and humanity. A notable decrease in the number of Catholic prisoners was something over which to rejoice; but there was another side of the picture. The Government seized the opportunity to revive previously deferred plans for a reduction in the number of Chaplains. The Bishop was not slow to point out the evils that must arise from such a policy:—

“HOBART TOWN,

“7th January, 1850.

“Sir,

“I have the honour to acknowledge your letter of the 24th ulto. relative to the employment of two Catholic Chaplains on Norfolk Island, and calling my attention to the numerical return of the religions as furnished in October last.

“In reply I beg leave to state that were these two Chaplains charged only with the spiritual care of about 300 convicts *under ordinary circumstances* no doubt both of them would not be necessary for this duty. Permit me, however, to place the matter in what I trust will be considered a proper light.

“1. That an arrangement was made in Downing Street, I believe when Lord Aberdeen was in office, that there should be two Catholic Chaplains on Norfolk Island, as there was then, and still is, an insuperable objection to have one clergyman alone at a distance so immense as fourteen hundred miles from another, in an Island so seldom visited.

“2. That not only have the 294 convicts to be attended, but the Military also who are Catholics (and I believe the majority are), and their families as well as a portion of the Civil Officers and their families.

“3. That, although numerically the duty may appear to be light, yet, it is to be remembered that a Chaplain has to attend at the prisoners' Barracks as early as from 4 to 5 o'clock each morning, according to the season of the year, for prayers, and the same in the evening. Also that each convict confined to a cell is visited every day: that there are always two full services for the prisoners on a Sunday, and one for the military and free people.

“4. That with convicts it is not enough to have mere congregational services: the good which may result from moral culture can only be expected, generally speaking, from private and frequent pastoral care, such as patiently reasoning with them on their conduct, according to

their dispositions and capacities, and watching over them with assiduity and deep interest.

"5. That it is also fair to take into consideration the sacrifice everyone must make who resides on that distant Island, from the unvarying monotony, limited intercourse with friendly society, and enervating effects of the climate. Taking these circumstances into consideration I feel assured the Right Honourable the Secretary of State will not be disposed to disturb an arrangement which, I have reason to believe, is producing much good.

"I have the honor, etc.,

"R. W. WILLSON,

"Catholic Bishop of Hobart Town".

A few months after this Dr. Willson told the Archbishop that he had been officially informed that "one Chaplain would be dispensed with". He added: "I have another subject to bring under Your Grace's notice, namely, the state of Norfolk Island. When I was in Sydney on my way back from the Island Your Grace omitted making any enquiries of that far off, but still important spot—but I did confer freely with our mutual friend the Bishop of Maitland [Dr. Davis] and expressed myself far from being satisfied with the qualifications of either Mr. Murray or Mr. Ryan, I presume the Bishop informed Your Grace of the nature of our conversation".

"Lately the Comptroller General of convicts returned from Norfolk Island, after spending five weeks there. His language regarding both these gentlemen, both to Mr. Cotham, who had a long conversation with him on his return, and to me on my arrival home after a journey, was perfectly respectful towards them; but he had seen that which he could not fail to observe, the unfitness of either to discharge an office so important both to the prisoners and to the Government".

In June, 1850, Father Murray said farewell to Norfolk Island: but the Rev. M. H. Ryan heroically held on. All the records bear testimony to this young priest's zeal and kindness: but at this early stage of his career, it is possible he lacked the prudence necessary for the peculiar office entrusted to him. At any rate such was the opinion of the Comptroller-General who gave the Bishop to understand that a clergyman of "more advanced age and greater experience than the Rev. Mr. Ryan is required at Norfolk Island. The Lieutenant-Governor is desirous that Your Lordship should nominate some one of the Chaplains now

employed in Van Diemen's Land for whom Mr. Ryan may be exchanged". The Bishop replied:—

"HOBART TOWN, 5th Sept., 1850.

"Sir,

"I have the honour to acknowledge your letter of the 27th ulto., acquainting me that His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor had decided that a clergyman of more advanced age and greater experience than the Revd. Mr. Ryan should be placed on Norfolk Island.

"In reply I beg leave to state that some two months since the most Reverend Archbishop Polding, to whom Mr. Ryan belongs, was informed of the reduction which had been directed by the Lieutenant-Governor, and a request made that as Mr. Ryan would be left alone on that distant Island, a gentleman of more advanced age and experience with convicts might be substituted.

"The communication I have been favoured with from the Archbishop is to the effect that no Catholic clergyman serving in New South Wales would consent to reside without a fellow-clergyman on Norfolk Island; and that if Mr. Ryan expressed a determination not to remain, he must not be compelled to do so in opposition to his will.

"With regard to the Catholic clergyman now serving in the Convict Department in Van Diemen's Land, no one would be willing to live alone at so great a distance as Norfolk Island, even if one could be spared, which, under present circumstances, I regret to say, would not be at all practicable.

"Permit me to remark that the objection a Catholic clergyman has to living permanently alone, arises principally from the following cause. It is a tenet of our Church that on the approach of death, it is requisite, if at all possible, to receive certain Sacraments—and that no one ought willingly to place himself in such a position, as not to have a reasonable chance of obtaining such spiritual aid, in the event of approaching death.

"For a clergyman to be placed alone permanently on Norfolk Island, is considered to be a case in point. To meet this difficulty, and also to provide for the moral culture of the convicts in the event of a protracted illness of a clergyman in such remote situation, Lord Aberdeen, some years since, kindly consented to the arrangement which had existed until His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor directed the late reduction. It is therefore with much regret I am not able to comply with the suggestion contained in your letter of the 27th ult.—I have the honor, etc.,

"R. W. WILLSON,
Catholic Bishop".

Dr. Polding had no priest willing to leave New South Wales. "In the event of Mr. Ryan being dismissed or removed" he said, "we have none in this Mission disposed to take up his duties and to remain without another priest on the Island: and, indeed, I apprehend I have not one who would give Your Lordship satisfaction in the discharge of these duties. In these circumstances the Island must remain without a Catholic Chaplain unless Your Lordship be enabled to supply the deficiency. In the event of Your Lordship undertaking to do this I am disposed to make over the jurisdiction of the Island so that it may be considered a portion of and belonging to the diocese of Hobartton".

After further correspondence it was agreed to ask Rome to transfer Norfolk Island to the diocese of Hobart Town. Meantime Dr. Willson was prepared to send a priest there provided he got Father M. H. Ryan in exchange. "I shall be glad for Mr. Ryan to be attached to this diocese, as a priest would have to be sent in his place—and as the Archdiocese of Sydney would be relieved from what has ever appeared to be a responsibility of a most awful nature Your Grace will see, I am sure, the justice of allowing a priest to be transferred with it". What the Archbishop thought of this proposal he did not say. One year later, on August 29, 1851, Dr. Willson made another attempt to reach some arrangement:

"It is with considerable reluctance I venture again to trouble Your Grace regarding Norfolk Island; but the language of Mr. Ryan, in pressing for a priest to be sent even for a short visit, is so strong, and the cry of those in bondage that I would visit them so loud that, however painful, I feel compelled to address you.

"I fear several months may yet pass over before intelligence can either reach Your Grace or me from Rome: in the meantime, the voice of reason and religion seems to demand an amelioration, if possible, of the condition of Mr. Ryan and those unhappy men who are in degradation and bondage. . .

"I now offer to visit Norfolk Island the next time the *Franklin* sails, which will be in about eight or ten weeks, in order to see what can be done to alleviate the state of the convicts, and afford spiritual comfort to Mr. Ryan, who has not seen a priest for *full 15 months*. That someone should go, I apprehend there can be no question, and I shall be too happy if you will depute the one from Sydney: I will engage to provide him a passage, although he would have to pay his table expenses. Should, however, Your Grace wish that I should be the person, you will be so kind as to say if I have faculties, including the power of administering

the Sacrament of Confirmation. I shall be obliged by an answer at your earliest convenience.

"The *Franklin* sailed yesterday for Norfolk Island crowded with prisoners: the large ship *Lady Kennaway* direct from England, but calling here, took about 100 convicts thither a few weeks ago. The number on the Island has increased full one third this year [1851]—it appears to be the intention of the Government to increase the number still more. It is a woeful place, although wonderfully improved.

If privations and trials are to be counted as blessings then, in truth, must Father Ryan be counted amongst those whom God loved. At the end of that year, 1851, he was still clamouring for "an immediate change being effected either by his removal from the Island or by a fellow-clergyman being sent to join him in the performance of his duties there".

At long last the Bishop was able to come to the rescue: one of his priests volunteered to go to Norfolk Island. This was the Rev. Timothy Lucas, a native of Limerick. For two years he had been assistant priest at Launceston: then a serious illness forced him to seek hospital treatment and rest in Sydney. Returning to his adopted diocese he told Dr. Willson that he was prepared to join Father Ryan. On 14th February, 1852, the Bishop notified Dr. Polding: "A ship was despatched the week before last with stores for Norfolk Island, and as she had excellent accommodations, and sailed from Launceston, Mr. Lucas availed himself of it, and is, I hope, nearly if not entirely there before this time". Happy to have a companion in solitude Father Ryan was contended to remain in his Pacific dungeon for another year.

In March, 1852, the Bishop himself paid his third and last visit to Norfolk Island. What he saw has been already told. In the beginning of 1853 he went off to Europe determined to plead with the British Government for the immediate abandonment of 'Paradise Lost', as the Chaplains called the Pacific dungeon. Meantime the two Chaplains devoted themselves wholeheartedly to their duties. When Father M. H. Ryan was recalled to Sydney the Rev. T. Lucas had sole charge. Then came the decision of the Holy See making the Island over to Dr. Willson's jurisdiction. Acting on instructions received from the Bishop the Vicar-General requested the Rev. John Murphy to undertake the difficult mission which has caused so much anxiety and misunderstanding. Father Edward Marum, then recovering from serious illness, went as companion and assistant. On July 20, 1853, these two priests fare-

welled Father Lucas who left the Island for Launceston. At their post they remained until the end of the chapter in the first weeks of 1855. Their beloved Bishop's campaign had ended in victory.

Many letters despatched and received had given pain to Dr. Willson. All that was now forgotten. It must have been with a heart full of joy that he took up his busy pen to have the last word:—

“HOBART TOWN,

“2nd July, 1856.

“My Lord Archbishop,

“When in Rome, 1854, I presented a petition to the Holy Father praying that in the event of Norfolk Island reverting to the civil Government of New South Wales His Holiness would allow the spiritual jurisdiction held by me to be transferred to Your Grace. The Holy Father was graciously pleased to grant the prayer of my petition.

“As the temporal Government of that ill-fated spot is again vested in the Governor in Chief of New South Wales my spiritual responsibility, by the Holy Father's gracious permission, ceases.

“I have the honor to be,

“Your Grace's humble servant—

“R. W. WILLSON, Bp. of Hobart”.¹

(To be continued).

JOHN H. CULLEN.

*

*

*

*

SHORT NOTICE.

THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION OF ENGLAND.

It is to be hoped that in the near future Australia may have its own “Catholic Biblical Association” to promote the study of the Book or books. Meanwhile we should like to see the published organ of the English CBA, entitled “Scripture”, having a wider circulation here. At present “Scripture” is known only to very few Australians, but it is definitely the desire of the present Pope, who in 1943 gave us a masterly Encyclical “Divino Afflante Spiritu”, that Catholic Biblical Associations should have wide support. The English Association has through its Secretary, Dr. Fuller, asked us to help them, and it is really in the spiritual and cultural interests of every priest and every religious community and of Catholic Actionists amongst the laity to give a generous response.

In order to assist a periodical, which is published below commercial price, the Editor of the *A.C.R.* has kindly consented to receive and transmit subscriptions.

The annual subscription to “Scripture” is only 8/- Australian. The Annual Subscription to the CBA (which includes “Scripture”) is only 10/6d. Australian. Whoever wishes to subscribe may send the respective sum to the *Australasian Catholic Record*, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

W.L.

¹LETTERS of Dr. Polding are in Hobart; Government correspondence in *State Records*; Dr. Willson's LETTERS in *Colonial Correspondence*; For Norfolk Island, see Dr. O'Brien and Dr. Ullathorne.

Dogmatic Theology

THE THEOLOGY OF THE MASS. I.

THE ONE TRUE SACRIFICE OF THE NEW LAW.

It's the Mass that matters; it's the Mass that conquers; it's the Mass that moulds the ages unto Christ.

The sacrifice of the Mass is the greatest work performed on God's earth. In it the Church finds her life and her perennial youth. It is the greatest source of hope for mankind, for "as often as we celebrate the commemoration of this victim the work of our redemption is carried out".¹ Let us ponder a little on this beautiful thought of the Liturgy. All salvation flows from the Cross of Christ, which was the altar of the whole world. Hence it is essential for salvation that each individual person make vital contact with Christ's saving sacrifice in order to participate in its redeeming merits. The sacrifice of propitiation for the sins of mankind, centred in the terrible drama of Calvary, did not of itself immediately redeem or sanctify so much as one soul. There the chalice of salvation was filled to overflowing, but each and every individual must approach and drink with his own lips the healing balm of the merits of our Saviour's passion. In other words, the sacrifice of the Cross, the universal cause of redemption, then only profits man when its power is individually applied to each member of the human family.

Now, the sovereign means of entering into vital contact with the Cross of Christ, the greatest and most intensive application of the copious fruits of the one Redeeming sacrifice, is found in the holy sacrifice of the Mass. It is not the mere shadow of Calvary falling upon our altars, but the reality itself. It is no mere representation or empty memorial of the sacrifice of the Cross, as a vivid drama represents some past event; no, it is the renewal, the re-presentation of the reality that took place on Calvary's hill. The same Jesus Christ who stretched His arms on the altar of the Cross and offered Himself to His heavenly Father, a victim of propitiation for the sins of mankind, is really and truly present on our altars, offering Himself through the hands of His priests, a victim of a perfect sacrifice, to apply to the souls of men the abundant fruits of His passion and death.

This sacrifice eternally seals and daily ratifies the treaty of peace between heaven and earth. It is the golden key to the infinite treasury of Christ's merits. It opens the bosom of God our Father and lets loose the purifying streams of grace on the thirsting souls of men. It places

¹Secret Prayer, 9th Sunday after Pentecost.

in our very hands the divine victim of propitiation who purchased our souls at such a price and now clasps them in the embrace of friendship and love. The sacrifice which we offer is the passion of Our Lord daily renewed in a bloodless manner on our altars. It is the one sacrifice acceptable to Almighty God; the one means by which we can worthily honour and praise Him; the one all-powerful means of making reparation for our innumerable offences, and of returning thanks for His countless benefits; and it is the richest source of grace for mankind. It is the most wonderful and most powerful work that is performed outside the bosom of the triune God.

The Mass is the compendium and the very soul of our sacred faith, the strongest unifying force that is found among men, the source of all our strength and hope and consolation. Without the Mass there is no christianity. And it is also true that the strength and zeal of the Church in any nation is found in direct proportion to the devotion and love of its people for this august sacrifice. It is the life of our life: without it we die.

Pope Leo XIII beautifully expresses all these thoughts: "It is a divine victim which is here immolated, and, accordingly, through this victim we offer to the Most Blessed Trinity all that honour which the infinite dignity of the Godhead demands; infinite in value and infinitely acceptable is the gift which we present to the Father in His only-begotten Son... Christ has willed that the whole virtue of His death, alike for expiation and impetration, should abide in the Eucharist, which is no mere empty commemoration thereof, but a true and wonderful, though unbloody and mystical, renewal of it... It must be considered as the very centre of Christian worship in which dwells Christian life in its entirety; all other methods of piety lead towards it and end with it".²

We are about to commence a rather exhaustive study of this great central rite of our Faith. It is a great mystery: a rite full of saving blood, and yet unbloody; death for sin is there clearly shown forth, and yet the victim is living. It is the eternal Pasch bequeathed to us by Him Who died for love of us, and is now our daily victim of the spotless oblation fashioned by Almighty God as the one and only sacrifice worthy of infinite Divinity. It is humble, yet magnificent; simple, yet august. It is the incomparable treasure of the Holy Catholic Church.

²Encyclical, "*Mirae Charitatis*", 1902; (a worthy monument to the piety and learning of such a great Pontiff).

THE VOICE OF ERROR.

Realizing that the holy sacrifice of the Mass is the soul of the Catholic Faith, the heretics of the 16th century conspired with steadfast unanimity to work its destruction. Martin Luther saw the point very clearly and gave the watchword: "Victory over the Mass spells ruin to the entire papacy".³ Moved by this profound, bitter hatred they vied with one another in conjuring up vitriolic expressions of their detestation. Luther (1483-1546) surpassed himself when giving vent to his feelings on this matter. "By far the most impious abuse of this sacrament of the Eucharist", he assures us, "is found in this that nothing is more commonly accepted or more firmly held in the church to-day than the doctrine that the Mass is a good work and a sacrifice".⁴ This, he writes, is "the greatest and most glaring scandal that must be removed, namely, the belief that the Mass is a sacrifice, offered to God".⁵ "The Mass—priesthood", he raves, "is absolutely a work of Satan...and the Masses, which are called sacrifices, are the height of idolatry and impiety".⁶

Calvin (1509-1564) was not less acrimonious in his condemnation of the Church's faith in the holy sacrifice. It was Satan himself, he tells us, who "blinded almost the whole world with this most noxious error of believing that the Mass is a sacrifice and an oblation to obtain the remission of sins".⁷ Calvin, in his blind hatred of the rite that had been the centre of Christianity for fifteen centuries, did not hesitate to stigmatize it as a vile concoction "bubbling over with every kind of impiety, blasphemy, idolatry, and sacrilege".⁸

The Anglican Church, having rejected the ancient Faith established by Christ, struck at its very roots when it rejected the sacrifice of the Mass. In the Book of Common Prayer (1548-1552), in the 42 Articles of faith published under Edward VI (1553), and in the 39 Articles of religion (The Westminster Confession) published under Elizabeth in 1562, the Church of England, shot through with Calvinism, made no attempt to disguise its hatred of the Mass. Article 31 of the Westminster Confession reads as follows: "The sacrifices of the Mass, in which the priest was commonly said to offer Christ in remission of punishment

³Contra Henricum Regem Angliae (1522) ; Opera, edd. Weimar, t. 106, p. 220.

⁴De Captivitate Babylonica Ecclesiae (1520) ; Ed. Weimar, t. 6, p. 512 ff.

⁵Ibid, p. 513.

⁶De Abroganda Missa Privata (1522) ; Ibid, t. 8, p. 411 ff.

⁷Institutio Religionis Christianae, l. 4, c. 18.

⁸Ibid, l. 4, c. 18.

or of sins for the living and the dead, are nothing but blasphemous figments of the imagination and pernicious impostures".⁹

Three main reasons were proffered by the innovators in an attempt to justify their stand against the Catholic doctrine:

- a) When Christ our Lord instituted the Eucharist at the Last Supper He called it His "Testament", not a sacrifice. Now, the Testament was nothing but a promise, the promise of remission of sins made to us by God and sealed by the death of Christ on Calvary. Therefore, in the Last Supper Christ did not offer Himself to God the Father in sacrifice.
- b) A sacrifice, of its very nature, consists in the physical immolation or destruction of the victim, as the sacrifices of the Old Law abundantly testify and the sacrifice of the Cross clearly and vividly confirms. But one will look in vain in the rite of the Mass for the physical shedding of Christ's Blood. Therefore, the Mass cannot possibly be a true sacrifice.¹⁰
- c) A sacrifice is a propitiatory rite in which a victim is offered to God to expiate the sins of men. But Christ, our Saviour, by his one perfect sacrifice on Calvary made perfect and complete propitiation for all the sins of mankind, leaving no room for further sacrifices of propitiation. Therefore, to hold that the Mass is a true sacrifice is nothing short of blasphemy and contempt for our Redeemer's all-saving sacrifice of propitiation on the altar of the Cross.

Nevertheless, if one looks more closely at the position taken up by the reformers one will easily see that the Mass was anathema for them primarily, if not solely, because it was radically incompatible with the fundamental principle of all Protestantism according to which man is justified by faith alone. That is the principle by which Protestantism stands or falls. It leaves no place for a true sacrifice of propitiation, and the heretics of the 16th century, together with their latest offspring, were prepared to deny and reject the whole of Christianity rather than forego

⁹The Ritualists or High Church Anglicans, holding as they do the doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ by consubstantiation, include in their ranks many who nostalgically seek in the eucharistic rite some notion of sacrifice. Cf. Charles Gore, *The Body of Christ*, ch. 3 (1902), p. 157 ff; B. B. Warfield, *Christ our Sacrifice*, *Princeton Theol. Review*, 1917, p. 385 ff.

¹⁰Zwinglius (1483-1531), than whom there was no more vigorous opponent of the Mass, made much of this argument. "Christ", he writes, "is offered in sacrifice only where he suffers, sheds his blood, and dies... But Christ can no longer die, suffer, or shed his blood. Therefore Christ can no longer be offered in sacrifice". (*Adversus Hieronymum Emserum Canonis Missae adsertorem antibolon*, p. 142).

the basic teaching of the temple of error they so feverishly desired to construct. We shall deal with their superficial and captious arguments later.

THE VOICE OF THE INFALLIBLE CHURCH.

The Church met the rising tide of error, which had been lashed into countless furious waves fiercely assailing almost every pillar of the edifice of Catholic doctrine, by calling christendom to the great Council of Trent. The whole of session twenty-two (1562) was devoted to the Sacrifice of the Mass. To preserve the ancient, absolute, divinely-revealed doctrine of the Mass in all its purity, and to guard it against the onslaughts of the new errors and heresies, the Council solemnly defined that the Mass is a true and proper sacrifice, and, indeed, a truly propitiatory sacrifice, instituted by Christ our Lord at the Last Supper when He also constituted His Apostles priests; that He commanded them, and their successors in the priesthood, to offer this true and visible sacrifice—the sacrifice of His own Body and Blood truly present under the species of bread and wine—by which the bloody sacrifice of Calvary is not only vividly represented but continually re-presented and renewed upon our altars, and by which the saving-power and merits of Christ's one bloody sacrifice are daily applied to the souls of men; that the sacrifice of the Mass is the same sacrifice as that of the Cross in this that the same victim is offered now as then, and the same priest, Christ our Lord, is the principal offerer; but that they differ in this that, whereas Christ poured out His Blood physically in the sacrifice of Calvary, being a victim physically immolated, in the Mass He is immolated and offered sacramentally under the visible species of bread and wine; and whereas Christ the High Priest was the sole offerer of the sacrifice of Redemption, in the Mass He offers Himself through the ministry of His priests, who partake of and prolong His priesthood throughout the ages.¹¹

The Fathers of the Council then pronounced their solemn condemnations of the various heresies propounded by the reformers. This they did in a series of precisely-formulated canons:

Canon 1: "If anyone says that in the Mass there is not offered to God a true and proper sacrifice, let him be anathema".

Canon 2: "If anyone says that by those words: 'Do this in commemoration of me' (Lc. 22, 19; 1 Cor. 11, 24), Christ did not constitute His Apostles priests, or that He did not thus ordain them, so that they and other priests should offer His Body and Blood, let him be anathema".

¹¹cf. Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, n. 937-940.

Canon 3: "If anyone says that the sacrifice of the Mass is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or that it is a bare, empty, commemoration of the sacrifice offered on the Cross, or that it is not a *propitiatory sacrifice*; or if anyone says that it profits only him who communicates; or says that it should not be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, penalties and satisfaction due for sins, and for other necessities, let him be anathema".

Canon 4: "If anyone says that the Mass imposes a blasphemy on the most holy sacrifice of Christ offered on the Cross, or that it takes away from that sacrifice, let him be anathema".¹²

Thus did the Council of Trent solemnly seal as dogmas of the Faith a body of truths that had been clearly taught from the beginning of Christianity and repeatedly inculcated in solemn declarations of the Church through the ages.¹³

In robbing the peoples of the world of the inestimable treasure of the sacrifice of the Mass the protestant reformers not only caused them to forfeit the soul of Christianity and the richest source of grace, but they placed them in an unique position in the whole history of religion; they made them the poorest and most pitiful object of that history: a religious people without a sacrifice! The history of religions teaches us that the custom of offering sacrifices was so universally accepted that there was scarcely a race or tribe that refrained from it. From this fact alone it may be inferred, with St. Thomas Aquinas,¹⁴ that the offering of sacrifice in general is founded on a law of nature, and that a religion without a sacrifice is a maimed and soulless rite because it lacks the central and supreme act of worship. On the other hand, the Eternal Son of God became man in order to institute the most perfect religion of all time. Therefore, *a priori* it is incredible that the true Christian religion should be without sacrifice.

Besides, is not the New Testament the full perfection of the Old Covenant? Was not the Old Law a mere figure and preparation for the perfect worship of God that was to be initiated by the Christ-Redeemer? And yet the imperfect religion of the Ancient Covenant had as its very heart that principal and most noble act of worship—the offering of sacrifice. Is, then, the full reality to be considered inferior to its shadow

¹²Denzinger, n. 948-951.

¹³E.g. by Innocent III, and the 4th Lateran Council (1215); the Councils of Orleans (1022), and Arras (1025), and Lyons (1274), Florence (1438).

¹⁴Summa Theol. 2-2, Q. 85, a. 1.

and figure? Is the crowning perfection to be less perfect than its imperfect precursor? This is unthinkable. But it would be true if the Mass were not a true and perfect sacrifice, for there is no other rite in all Christianity that lays claim to the perfection of sacrifice, as all admit.

A Protestant might raise this objection: The sacrifice of the Cross was the all-perfect sacrifice. It leaves no room for any other. Once and for all supreme sacrificial honour was given to God, and any further sacrifice is unacceptable before the throne of the Most High.

This objection is not only superficial; it is sophistical. If the sacrifice of the Cross, *by reason of its intrinsic perfection*, excluded all future sacrifice from divine worship, why did not the adoration offered by Christ to God His Father exclude, *by reason of its intrinsic infinite perfection*, all further adoration on the part of men? Why should there be any religion at all, since Christ worshipped His Father with a religion that was infinite in dignity and merit? If it is maintained that man is bound *by his very nature* to worship God his Creator and Sovereign Lord, let us remember also that the duty of offering sacrifice is equally based on a law of nature, a law which man has recognized and fulfilled since the dawn of history.

Perhaps it would not be fitting, after Christ's all-perfect sacrifice, to immolate and offer victims of less worth than the infinite Victim of Calvary. In fact, God Himself has assured us that such offerings are no longer acceptable in His sight.¹⁵ But such is not the case with the holy sacrifice of the Mass. In this sacrifice the Victim is the same sacred Victim of Calvary, now immolated under the sacramental species, and offered to God in a supreme act of worship to celebrate the memory of His one bloody sacrifice and to receive the abundant fruits merited for us in that holocaust of love.

But, however persuasive these a priori considerations may be, they would never suffice as a foundation for faith, nor could they ever justify the solemn definitions of the Church in relation to the Mass-sacrifice. The question is wholly and solely a matter of evidence. Has Almighty God, Truth infallible, revealed to men that the Mass is, indeed, a true and proper sacrifice, the one sacrifice of the New Law, the one act of inconceivable wonder by which we can worthily adore and honour Him, return thanks for His countless and priceless blessings, make reparation

¹⁵cf. Malachias, 1, 10 ff; Hebrews, 10, 5 ff.

for our innumerable and immeasurable offences against His infinite majesty and sanctity, and receive most copiously of His riches and blessings? We must listen to the voice of God which alone can direct our steps in the path of truth.

THOMAS MULDOON.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICES

WAY OF THE CROSS, prepared and arranged by F. J. Bryant, M.S.C.
Publishers: Pellegrini & Co.

Fr. Bryant, to quote the Words contained in the "Prayer before the Altar," at the front of his little booklet, takes the lay-man, and the priest, along the Way of the Cross, "with a humble and contrite heart, and with fervour and devotion". Verbal representations of the Stations are coupled with expressive illustrations, and one is stirred to sentiments of sorrow and repentance by the full, though simple prayers which conclude each consideration.

M.N.

* * * *

THE OSTERLEY SELECTION FROM THE LATIN FATHERS, *Edit.* by J. Crehan, S.J., London, Longmanns Green and Co., 1950. Pp. 109.

This useful little book collects some striking passages from the Latin Fathers for the use of ecclesiastical students, and, it is hoped, of boys in the higher classes of Latin, as well as for all students of Latin literature. The choice of texts has been most carefully made, and was, it is clear, a labour of love. St. Augustine looms largely, but there are choice texts from Tertullian, St. Jerome, Cassiodorus, St. Leo, Vincent of Lérins, St. Patrick (the *Confession*, XVI—XVIII), the Venerable Bede, and many others. Each passage is followed by brief notes, which deal with knotty grammatical points in the text, as well as historical notes of interest. It is a book that should arouse interest and lead the reader to pursue further the study of the Fathers. The vigorous form of Latin used might prove refreshing for boys and girls in the year between the Intermediate and Leaving Certificates.

L.B.P

Moral Theology & Canon Law

EUCCHARISTIC FAST FOR ATTENDANTS OF SICK BY NIGHT AND CERTAIN CLASSES OF SICK.

Dear Rev. Sir,

The *A.C. Record* for July, 1948, published a decree giving our Ordinaries faculties to allow non-alcoholic drinks and medicine, up to two hours before receiving Holy Communion, to sexagenarians in a weak state of health, pregnant women and nursing mothers, the sick in hospitals, and those ministering to the sick at night.

Our Ordinary has made this privilege applicable to the diocese. Will you kindly explain,

(1) Is solid medicine allowed?

(2) Is this privilege available to those in hospital, who are suffering from only a mild and short illness?

(3) Is it available to pregnant women and nursing mothers who are strong and who would not suffer any undue inconvenience by fasting?

(4) Would "aegrorum ministri" include doctors who are often called out at night for work which may take two hours or more. Catholic doctors who like to receive Holy Communion every Sunday are asking if they could use this privilege after being called out for work in the early hours of Sunday.

(5) Would the privilege be available to resident doctors in a hospital, who are on duty all night?

I would be pleased if you would enlighten readers on these and other points arising from the decree.

J.H.L.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Concerning the recent faculty to dispense from the Eucharistic fast, will you kindly reply to the following queries.

(1) Does the faculty permit nursing Sisters (religious) in a Catholic hospital to receive Holy Communion only *three times* in the week? In view of the fact that nuns are accustomed to receive every day, is any provision made in this faculty to permit those on night duty to receive daily after breaking their fast as permitted by the faculty?

(2) May food be taken by night sisters up to four hours before the reception of Holy Communion or must midnight be considered the

limit to the time in which food may be taken? The faculty seems to consider only drink which is non-alcoholic, may be taken after midnight, and this up to two hours before the reception of Holy Communion.

(3) Could sick people who are not sixty and are sick at home be entitled to the use of this faculty? It appears that all the sick in hospital are entitled to the use of the faculty.

REGENS.

REPLY.

The faculty in question was granted to the Ordinaries of Australia and New Zealand on 12th January, 1948, for a period of three years. The Ordinaries petitioned for the faculty to dispense from the Eucharistic fast by way of drink and medicine four classes of the faithful—sexagenarios adversa valetudine laborantes, mulieres praegnantes et lactantes, infirmos in nosocomiis degentes necnon aegrorum ministros.

The petition was granted in the following terms:

Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Pius Papa XII audita relatione infrascripti Cardinalis Pro-Praefecti Sacrae Congregationis de Sacramentis, attentis expositis, Oratoribus facultatem dispensandi indulget juxta petita, ter in hebdomada, dummodo quod attinet ad aegrorum ministros, agatur de nocturna assistentia et grave adsit incommodum in servando jejunio, remota quacumque scandali et admirationis occasione, servato ab omnibus jejunio duarum horarum a potu non-alcoholico.

Contrariis quibuscumque minime obstantibus
Praesentibus valituris ad triennium.

Habitual faculties—those, namely, which are conferred in perpetuum, or for a fixed period of time, or for a certain number of cases—are equivalent in canon law to privileges praeter jus. The basic rule for interpreting any law, rescript or privilege is to take the proper signification of the words employed—both their common acceptance and their canonical usage. Thus, it is stated, a privilege is to be understood according to its tenor and it may not be extended or restricted. (Canon 67, Cf. Can. 18, 49).

In doubt, privileges like rescripts generally are to be interpreted broadly except in four cases specified, namely, when they concern litigation, when they impair rights vested in other persons, when they contravene the law in the interest of private parties, when they are obtained for the purpose of securing an ecclesiastical benefice, in these four cases they bear a strict interpretation. However, in the case of privileges, the

interpretation must always be such that the persons who have the privilege may receive some favour from the benevolence of the granter. (Canon 68).

To reply to the queries:

(1) Yes, solid medicine is allowed. In the rescript the term "medicine" is unqualified. According to the ordinary use of the term it means that which tends directly to heal an ailment, whether liquid or solid. The privilege, then, should not be more restricted than the general usage of the term warrants. This is the doctrine of authors generally in interpreting Canon 858.

(2) Yes. All who are sick in hospital may be dispensed. Even though an illness is only "mild and short," its victim is included in the term "infirmi".

(3) Yes. Nursing mothers and pregnant women are eligible for dispensation, even though they experience no special inconvenience in observing the fast, as the terms of the rescript impose no such restriction. This condition applies only in the case of "aegrorum ministri".

(4) The terms of the rescription do not specify, even indirectly, a minimum period of time in which a person should be attending the sick in order to be eligible for the dispensation. The conditions required are firstly, that it is a matter of attending the sick at night, secondly, that a grave inconvenience is experienced in observing the fast. It would seem a fair conclusion that the doctor who is called to a case for a couple of hours in the early hours of the morning may qualify for the dispensation. Cases need to be considered individually, to determine whether there is grave inconvenience or not.

(5) Applying the principles outlined in (4) above, if the doctor attends the sick during the night it is a matter of determining whether this involves a grave inconvenience in observing the fast.

(1) The faculty permits the dispensation to be granted for Holy Communion three times in the week. It cannot be extended beyond the clear meaning of its terms. To enable religious sisters engaged in night nursing to receive daily after breaking their fast a new indult must be obtained from the Holy See.

In a similar faculty granted to the Ordinaries of the United States in 1946 in favour of night workers generally, the dispensation may be granted for Sundays and Feasts of Precept and for one other day each week and, in the case of nursing sisters (religious) it may be granted

for daily Communion, provided the previous night has been spent in the service of the sick.

It will be recalled that when the Ordinary dispenses "infirmi" in virtue of the faculty of the Formula Maior, in the case of priests and religious, Holy Communion is permitted daily.

(2) Food may not be taken after midnight. Those favoured by the rescript must be considered as bound by the common law except insofar as the faculty states a relaxation. Specifically they are permitted to take non-alcoholic drink until two hours before receiving Holy Communion. As food is not mentioned they must fulfil the common law in that respect, fasting from midnight.

In the faculty granted to American Ordinaries, referred to above, the terms of the dispensation for night-workers are that they fast from solid food for four hours, from liquid for one hour prior to receiving Holy Communion, and from alcoholic drink from midnight.

(3) People who are under sixty and are sick at home are not eligible for a dispensation under this faculty, unless, of course, it is someone who falls into the category of *praegnantes et lactantes*. It is simply a matter of taking the document at its face value. The persons in question may well come within the dispensing power conferred in the Formula Maior (No. 18).

*

*

*

*

FACULTIES SUBDELEGATED BY BISHOP—USE OUTSIDE ONE'S OWN DIOCESE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Is there any justification for the view that priests who have received subdelegated faculties from their bishops may use these, in whole or in part outside their dioceses? e.g., the authority to impart the Apostolic Indulgences, to distribute Holy Communion to the sick after taking medicine or something "per modum potus," etc.

BERNARDUS.

REPLY.

Some of the habitual faculties delegated to Ordinaries by the Holy See may be subdelegated—in the Formula Maior these are designated by an asterisk. To answer the query of our correspondent we should determine, firstly, to what extent the Ordinary himself may exercise these delegated faculties outside his diocese. In the absence of any restrictive clauses in the act of subdelegation it may be assumed, *ceteris paribus*, that the priest's subdelegated faculty is co-extensive with the delegated faculty of the Ordinary.

In the official *Animadversions* appended to the *Formula Maior*, the principle is laid down that the Ordinary may exercise all the faculties listed in that document *intra fines jurisdictionis suae*—within the limits of his jurisdiction. Canonical jurisdiction is restricted in several ways—by reason of the subject on whom it is exercised, by reason of the nature of the power exercised, by reason of the matter in question, which may, of its nature, impose local restrictions on the exercise of the power (Canon 201).

(I) By reason of the subject—Jurisdiction may be exercised directly only in regard to the Superior's subjects (Canon 201, 1). There are certain exceptions to this principle, e.g., those who have faculties, whether ordinary or delegated, to hear Confessions in a certain territory may absolve validly and licitly *vagi* and *peregrini* as well as those who are subjects by reason of domicile or quasi-domicile (Canon 881). Likewise, the power of the Ordinary and the Parish Priest to dispense from the laws of Sunday observance and of fast and abstinence may be exercised also in favour of *peregrini*.

(II) By reason of the nature of the power—*Voluntary* jurisdiction may be exercised in one's own favour, or while outside one's own territory, or upon a subject who is outside the territory, unless the contrary is evident from the nature of the case or from provision of law. For instance, a Bishop who is actually outside his diocese, may dispense from matrimonial impediments in favour of his own subjects; likewise, if they are outside the diocese.

On the other hand, *judicial* power may not be exercised in one's own favour, nor, generally speaking, while outside one's own territory. The law specifies certain exceptions to this rule. Thus, those who have ordinary power of absolving—local Ordinaries, pastors, parochial vicars with full parochial powers—may absolve their own subjects anywhere (Canon 881, 2). Likewise, a judge who has been expelled by force from his own territory, or is prevented from exercising his jurisdiction there, may exercise his office outside his own territory, but should inform the local Ordinary of the proceedings.

(III) By reason of the matter—From the very nature of the case, some powers may be exercised only within the Superior's own territory, e.g., the faculty of erecting Stations of the Cross.

Applying these principles to the cases submitted, it appears that a sub-delegated priest may attach the Apostolic Indulgences to rosary beads while outside his diocese, but only in favour of the Ordinary's

subjects. Likewise he may dispense from the Eucharistic fast in the manner permitted by the faculty, with the same reservation. However, in exercising such faculties outside one's own diocese, due regard must be had for public order and, often, it would be advisable to leave the exercise of jurisdiction to the local authority.

* * * *

DOES FAVOUR CEASE WHEN ORDINARY'S FACULTY TO
GRANT FAVOUR CEASES.

Dear Rev. Sir,

A priest obtained permission from his Ordinary to read prohibited books for purposes of study. The Ordinary is now dead and, seemingly, the Bishop no longer has the faculty to grant this permission. May the priest carry on with the permission obtained from the late Bishop?

JOANNES.

REPLY.

Assuming that the deceased bishop's faculty contained no restrictive clause in regard to the duration of the favour, and assuming that the concession was made without any such restriction, the priest retains his permission until it is withdrawn by the competent authority.

If the query concerned a subdelegated faculty to grant permission, and not the permission itself, the reply should be otherwise. For instance, if the bishop had subdelegated a certain priest to grant this concession in suitable cases, that priest's subdelegated faculty would lapse automatically when the bishop's delegated faculty was withdrawn.

It is worthy of note that in the relevant faculty of the Formula Maior, the Ordinary's concession to read forbidden books may be made for a period of not more than three years.

* * * *

CHILD OF NON-CATHOLIC PARENTS BAPTIZED
PRIVATELY IN DANGER OF DEATH.

Dear Rev. Sir,

John, a child of non-Catholic parents, being in danger of death at birth, was baptized privately by a Catholic nurse. John did not die, however, but was reared as a non-Catholic and is now about to be married.

In view of the abrogation of the latter part of paragraph 2 of Canon 1099, may John contract a valid marriage before a non-Catholic minister?

TITUS.

REPLY.

A similar query has been discussed already in the *A.C. Record* (Oct., 1949). The reply given in that issue is repeated here in resume. Since the abrogation of the latter part of Canon 1099, par. 2, the canonical form of marriage must be observed by those who may be designated as in *ecclesia Catholica baptizati*. The question is, then, whether the child of non-Catholic parents, baptized lawfully by a Catholic nurse, on account of danger of death, is to be accounted as one baptized in the Catholic Church, or as one baptized in the sect in which his parents would have intended his baptism.

In a certain sense, all who have been baptized validly may be said to have been baptized in the Catholic Church, since administration of this sacrament is an exclusive right of the Church. However, in this context the phrase has a more restricted value and includes only those who, in receiving Baptism, are rightfully accredited to membership of the Church by the *intention* of the subject, if he is an adult, or of the parents or minister, if an infant is baptized. Thus an adult is said to be baptized in a certain church by reason of his requesting Baptism from the minister of that church. In the case of infants the request of parents or lawful guardians will be the determining factor; otherwise, the intention of the minister.

Children of non-Catholic parents may be baptized lawfully by a Catholic minister only in two cases; (I) if the infant is in such danger of death that it may be judged prudently that the infant will die before reaching the age of reason; and (II), outside danger of death, if due provision is made for the Catholic upbringing of the child, and if the request is made by parents or lawful guardians, or if these no longer exercise their office. (Canons 750-751).

If an infant of non-Catholic parents is baptized unlawfully, in violation of these canons, and, subsequently, is brought up outside the Catholic religion, he should not be reckoned as one "baptized in the Catholic Church." If, however, such an infant is baptized lawfully—as in the case submitted above—it would appear a reasonable conclusion that he is one "baptized in the Catholic Church", even though his subsequent upbringing was not as a Catholic. The weight of authority confirms this view; also, a private reply of the Holy Office concerning a child of infidel parents, baptized in infancy, in danger of death, by a Catholic doctor and, subsequently, brought up in paganism. However,

this conclusion is not beyond all doubt and we may hope for authoritative decisions or an official interpretation in the future.

In reply to our correspondent's query, therefore, the opinion is offered that the person in question is bound to the canonical form of marriage.

* * * *

SINS AGAINST SOCIAL JUSTICE.

Dear Rev. Sir,

A lot is written about the obligations of Social Justice but little to define the sins committed when Social Justice is neglected. When in a discussion on Social Justice I mentioned that ever since Leo XIII and *Rerum Novarum* the Church had laid down the obligations, the answer came back that for fifty years that encyclical had been a dead letter in most countries, and the clergy had never applied any spiritual penalties to the faithful who ignored the precepts of the Encyclicals.

Would you mind answering the following specific questions on the matter.

A. An employer in a factory only carries out the minimum obligations of the penal law in doing justice to his employees. He makes no account of the spirit of Social Justice and in many matters offends against the various conditions elaborated by Catholic sociologists. What sins does he commit and what are their gravity?

B. A pastor completely ignores Social Justice in the Tribunal and his parishioners know that fact. What is his culpability?

PAROCHUS.

REPLY.

Those who claimed that the encyclical *Rerum Novarum* of Pope Leo XIII had been for fifty years a dead letter in most countries surely are unaware of many powerful factors in the history of the last half-century. It is scarcely in the scope of this article to reply to such a sweeping claim. The activity of Catholic sociologists in the intellectual, political, and industrial fields is impressive, while the well-known encyclicals of successive Popes have provided a treasury of sound doctrine to match erroneous theory and practice in various social fields. To describe a document published in 1891 as having been a dead letter for fifty years is to accord it the most ephemeral value. This contention is not borne out by facts.

From the nature of the case it is difficult to define what sins are

committed against social justice. For this reason alone it seems an unwarranted condemnation of the clergy that they have refrained from applying "spiritual penalties to the faithful who ignored the precepts of the Encyclicals". The aim of the clergy should be to promote a widespread knowledge of the papal encyclicals, to inculcate a healthy regard for the principles of natural law which they expound, to encourage observance of their principles, individually, amongst those better situated to apply them—employers of labour, union executives, politicians. To assess each individual's observance or non-observance of his obligations in social justice would be beyond the capacity of pastors and any attempt to do so on a large scale would surely involve imprudence.

To give a specific reply to the specific queries of our correspondent would be to attempt what established moralists do not achieve in their manuals of moral theology. To pass judgment on the conduct of the factory employer, it would be necessary to know much detail as to conditions of work, industrial awards, etc. It should be recognised that much has been achieved for the benefit of the worker in recent years, due in no small measure to the social programme initiated by the papal encyclicals. Many of these improvements have legal sanction in the form of parliamentary statutes and industrial awards. An employer who "only carries out the minimum obligations of the penal law in doing justice to his employees", is fulfilling, even unwillingly, a substantial part of his obligations. While there remains a shortage of labour, it is not easy for an employer to disregard his legal obligations.

In reference to the pastor of Query B, it should be admitted that his scope for inculcating social justice in the sacrament of Penance is very limited; much less is his opportunity for assessing the gravity of sins against this virtue. If one of his parishioners is known publicly as a violator of social justice, he should approach this man in the spirit of charity.

*

*

*

*

OCCASION OF SIN.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Marcus was a soldier in a camp near a town. From past experience of his weakness he knew that he would be in at least a remote occasion of sin contra sextum on a visit to the town. On a particular evening he set off with the sole intention of attending the pictures. However, when offered contraceptives at the gate, he accepted one,

thinking that he would use it in the possible case that he might consent to a temptation.

However, this did not eventuate. Afterwards, in a mood of remorse, he asked if that act constituted an intention of committing an immoral act, in addition to the malignity of accepting the significance of the contraceptive.

In discussion with some colleagues the usual difference of opinion arose. Some said that the carrying of the articles enclosed the intention, at least "in causa". The others argued that he had one intention only in going to the town and merely took precautions in view of a possible failure to resist temptation in spite of a good resolution.

F.G.

REPLY.

Marcus' intention to use the contraceptive in case he should have immoral relations is sinful. However, his accepting the contraceptive and his conditional intention of using it would not necessarily exclude his resolution to resist temptation to immoral acts. Therefore, it cannot be said that, already, he has committed an immoral action in his intention. Nevertheless, he may have made the remote occasion more proximate by taking possession of the contraceptive. This should be decided by reference to his past record. Probably this is what certain disputants meant by saying that he had the intention of committing an immoral act, "at least in causa".

*

*

*

*

PARENT'S OBLIGATION FOR CHILD'S RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

Dear Rev. Sir,

A Catholic man attempts marriage in a non-Catholic church and the marriage lasts for three months—when his non-Catholic partner departs from him on the ground that he has proved unfaithful. He denies the accusation and claims that her departure is due to the fact that he desired to have the marriage convalidated.

In due course a child is born and the husband pays the hospital expenses, at the same time refraining from seeing the child without the express wish of the mother.

Each has lost interest in the other now and the case will probably finish up in the divorce courts. The question, however, arises: Is the father bound to go to the utmost to gain custody of the child, thereby giving it the chance of a Catholic upbringing? Assuming that he is

bound, but is unaware of his obligation, would his confessor be advised or obliged to remind him of it? There is a possibility that the girl's accusation is true, judging from the general manner of the husband and that, therefore, he would be loth to make such a demand and would, probably, refuse.

CAPILLARIUS.

REPLY.

The father's undoubted obligation is to provide for the child's material and spiritual education, including a Catholic upbringing. Obtaining custody of the child may or may not be a necessary or opportune means to this end. A prudent confessor should weigh carefully the legal chances of the father being granted custody of the child by a court, the father's physical and moral ability to provide for its Catholic upbringing, the mother's willingness to arrange for a Catholic education—and advise the father accordingly.

The law of the Code, effective when ecclesiastical judges heard all matrimonial suits, decrees that, in case of separation of husband and wife, the education of the children should be entrusted to the innocent party or, in case of mixed religion, to the Catholic party; in both cases, however, it is left to the discretion of the Ordinary to arrange otherwise, provided that due provision is made for the Catholic upbringing of the children. (Canon 1132). Though ineffective in modern conditions, this law may act as a guide in determining moral obligations in various situations.

In practice, it is very probable that the legal custody of the child would be given to the mother by a civil judge, regardless of whether the decision preceded or followed upon a civil divorce. If sound legal advice confirms this likelihood, it would appear more advisable for the father not to contest the matter, but, rather, to make an approach to the mother with a view to arranging for the child's Catholic upbringing by mutual agreement. Likewise if the father is unsuited, morally, to be directly responsible for the child's religious upbringing, he may be prevailed upon to make a reasonable approach to the mother, invoking her good will. This would seem to be such an arrangement as an ecclesiastical judge might make in virtue of Canon 1132.

JAMES CARROLL.

Liturgy

NOTES CONCERNING THE CHURCH AND ITS FURNISHINGS. V.

1.—*The Credence Table.*

The *Caerimoniale Episcoporum* (Lib. I, xii, 19) and the *Missale Romanum* (Rub. gen. xx) prescribe a table at the epistle side of the sanctuary. On this table, which ought to be oblong in shape, are placed the cruets, communion plate, and other things required during the celebration of Mass. The table should be set out from the wall so that the servers may kneel behind it. It may be made of either wood or stone. The table should have a white linen covering, and on solemn feasts this covering should reach down to the ground on all sides. Custom has not considered the covering of the whole table to be of strict obligation, especially in cases where the table is of ornamental structure.

2.—*The Sedilia.*

At the epistle side of the sanctuary there should also be a special seat, on which the Celebrant and the Sacred Ministers may sit during Mass and Office. It should be sufficiently long to allow the Ministers to sit comfortably side by side, and should have a low back to allow the vestments to hang freely behind, when the Ministers are seated. The sedilia may be of either wood or stone. It should be without armrests. Except on Good Friday and in Offices of the Dead, the sedilia should have a covering, which may be the colour of the office of the day, or green, or red; violet is used in penitential seasons.

3.—*The Pulpit.*

The pulpit is ordinarily erected on the gospel side of the church, but in a cathedral church it will be placed on the epistle side, as the Bishop's throne is on the gospel side. Usually the pulpit will be within the sanctuary, however, in large churches, it may be set up in the nave, provided that it is not too far removed from the altar. A bookstand and a light are very useful appurtenances of the pulpit. It may be draped in the colour of the day, black being used in Offices of the Dead.

4.—*The Communion Rails.*

The communion rail has a twofold purpose, it is a support for the communion cloth, and a barrier between the sanctuary and the body of the church. Formerly the rails were moveable, and, indeed, they may still be so constructed. However, they are more usually a fixture, in the

form of a balustrade or grille of stone, wood, or metal. It is well to remember that the communion cloth is still required by liturgical law, even though the communion plate is used. A step is generally placed in front of the rails, which serves as a kneeler for the communicants. It should not be too high or too narrow; one author suggests six inches high and twelve inches wide.

5.—*The Sacrarium.*

A church must have a basin fitted with an outlet pipe leading to the ground underneath the church. Into this basin is emptied the water used for the washing of the altar linen and the sacred vessels, also blessed Ashes that may be left over, bread crumbs that have been used in the sacred ceremonies, and other things which, according to the directions of the rubrics, are to be placed in the sacrum. It may be set in the sanctuary, close to the altar on the epistle side, or in a niche in the wall, or in the sacristy. The basin, which may be of metal or stone, should be fitted with a lid.

In our next issue we will deal with the Holy Oils Ambry, the Baptistry, the Confessionals, and the Stations of the Cross.

R. F. DONOHOE.

* * * *

QUERIES.

WHY ODD NUMBER OF PRAYERS IN THE MASS—PRAYER
FIDELIUM ADDRESSED TO GOD THE FATHER.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. Why do the rubrics of the Missal lay down three, five, or seven prayers for a Votive Mass?

2. Is the prayer *Fidelium, Deus, omnium conditor et redemptor* . . . addressed to God the Father or to God the Son? What is the correct ending? Is it: *Qui vivis et regnas cum Deo Patre* . . . ?

L.B.P.

REPLY.

1. In low Masses of simple rite, either of a feast or of a feria, the greater privileged ferias excepted, and in private votive Masses the celebrant may add, after the prayers prescribed by the rubrics and the Ordinary, other prayers according to his choice, provided that the total number of prayers be odd and not more than seven (cfr. Rub. gen. ix, 12; Addit. vi, 6).

As a general rule, the more solemn the feast the fewer the prayers, and so the greatest feasts of the year have but one prayer. In the earli-

est Sacramentaries of the Roman Rite we usually find only one prayer for each feast. This single prayer is in accord with the brevity and conciseness characteristic of the Roman Rite, however, a different mentality, as evidenced in the Gallican rites, soon found the single prayer insufficient to express its devotion, and so the number of prayers began to grow. In the 9th century, Amalarius of Metz recalled the Roman custom of a single prayer, even on days on which more than one feast or solemnity occurred (*De eccles. officiis*, Praef., P.L. 105, 987). Bernold of Constance (11th cent.) reminded his contemporaries of the same custom, and deplored the fact that some priests added so many prayers that they wearied their congregations and turned the people away from Mass. The more prudent, says the same writer, even though they sometimes add to the traditional single prayer, rarely allow the number to go beyond seven, as the seven petitions of the Lord's Prayer embrace all the needs of men. Bernold also refers to the practice of retaining an odd number of prayers; one because of the roman tradition, three because Our Lord prayed three times before His Passion, five because of the five wounds of Our Saviour, and seven because of the seven petitions of the Our Father (cfr. *Micrologus*, iv, P.L. 151, 980). Writing two centuries later, Pope Innocent III, after mentioning the usual mystical explanations given for the odd number of prayers, adds the consideration of the traditional perfection attributed to odd numbers, so, for instance, Virgil declares: 'Numero deus impare gaudet' (*Ecolog.* viii, 75). Similarly Pliny writes: 'Cur impares numeros ad omnia vehementiores credimus?' (*Hist. nat.* xxviii, 5). The indivisibility of the odd number is a further source of its perfection (cfr. *De sacro altaris mysterio*, ii, 27, P.L. 217, 814-815; also Sicard of Cremona, *Mithrale*, iii, 2, P.L. 213, 99).

Under the influence of such ideas, both mystical and traditional, the present rubric was incorporated into the Missal. However, the odd number did not receive the importance and general application that some of the writers, who have been quoted, would have attributed to it.

2. As it appears in the Roman Missal, the prayer *Fidelium* is undoubtedly addressed to God the Son, and hence the conclusion will be: *Qui vivis et regnas cum Deo Patre*... There is good reason to believe, however, that it was not always so, and that this prayer was originally addressed to God the Father, as was the usual practice of the early Church. This practice of directing most, if not all, prayers to the Father, through the Son, was expressed by the Council of Hippo (A.D.

393) in the following manner: 'cum altari assistitur, semper ad Patrem dirigatur oratio'. In the two earliest Sacramentaries, the Leonine and the Gelasian, all the prayers are directed to God the Father, and the same is probably true of the Gregorian Sacramentary (c. VII cent.). Sicard of Cremona (+ 1215), in reply to the question whether the 'redemptor' in the prayer *Fidelium* is Christ, affirms: 'ad Patrem sermo dirigitur' (*Mithrale*, iii, 2, P.L. 213, 100). Evidently some doubts had arisen as to the propriety of applying the term to the First Person of the Blessed Trinity, but there is sufficient justification of the usage to be found in scriptural language. God is frequently called 'redemptor' in the Old Testament, e.g. Ps. 18, 15; 77, 35, while St. Paul, in the Pastoral Epistles, applies the word 'salvator' several times to God the Father. In view of the scriptural usage, the evidence of the early liturgical books, that the *Fidelium* was originally addressed to God the Father, is quite intelligible. Another example of such a change is the prayer of the Mass of the Vigil of the Assumption: 'Deus, qui virginalem aulam beatae Mariae, in qua habitares, eligere dignatus es....' This prayer is now addressed to God the Son, but most probably it was originally addressed to God the Father, the 'habitares' being understood of dwelling by means of grace.

*

*

*

*

WHY WHITE VESTMENTS FOR BIRTHDAY OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST?

Dear Rev. Sir,

St. John the Baptist was a martyr, why, then, are white vestments worn on his feast—June 24th?

JACOBUS.

The developed system of liturgical colours of the modern Roman Rite was not known to the early ages of the Church. It seems very probable that multi-coloured vestments were not uncommon, and the first association of one particular colour with particular festivals does not appear much earlier than the 9th century. Pope Innocent III is the first writer to treat, at length, the question of the liturgical colours and their use. He enumerates the five colours which are now laid down in the rubrics (*Rub. gen. Missalis*, xviii). The present rubric prescribes the use of red vestments for, amongst others, the feasts of Apostles and Martyrs, but with certain exceptions. The feast of St. John (Dec. 27th), the feasts of the Chair of St. Peter, of St. Peter *ad Vincula*, of the Conversion of St. Paul, and of the Birthday of St. John the Baptist

(June 24th), all have white as their liturgical colour. Seemingly, red is used only when the feast is directly concerned with the martyrdom of the Saint, so, for example, it is used for the feast of the Beheading of St. John the Baptist, but not for his Birthday. Likewise, the principal feast of St. John the Apostle has white, whereas red is used for the feast of St. John before the Latin Gate. This distinction between feasts was made even in the time of Pope Innocent III, who informs us that white was used on the Birthdays of the Saviour and the Precursor, since each was born pure, that is free from original sin (cfr. *De sacro altaris mysterio*, i, 65, P.L. 217, 800-801).

*

*

*

*

COMMON OF POPES.

Dear Rev. Sir,

Is the Mass *Si diligis* of the Common of one or many Sovereign Pontiffs to be used on the feasts of all Popes? On the feast of St. Silverius (June 20th) should the epistle have been the one from the Common, or the proper epistle from St. Jude, as found in the Missal?

SODALIS.

REPLY.

The decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (9th January, 1942), which introduced the new Mass and Office of Supreme Pontiffs, stated that the new Common should be used on the feast of one or many Sovereign Pontiffs, both martyrs and confessors, who do not have a proper Mass in the Roman Missal. In practice this means that the Mass of the feast of St. Clement (Nov. 19th) is of the Common *Si diligis*, with the exception of the Introit and Epistle which are proper. All three prayers (Collect, Secret, and Postcommunion) are proper in the Masses of St. Gregory I (March 12th) and St. Callistus (Oct. 14th); the first prayer is proper on the feasts of St. Marcellus (Jan. 6th), St. Pius (May 5th), St. Peter Celestine (May 19th), and St. Gregory VII (May 25th); with the exception of these prayers, the Mass is, for all the above, of the Common. The *Credo* is added to the Masses of St. Leo and St. Gregory I, both being Doctors of the Church. For the rest, the Mass on the feast of all other Popes is taken from the Common with the appropriate variations in the prayers for a Martyr or Confessor, and for one or several Popes. Consequently, on the feast of St. Silverius the entire Mass is taken from the Common as there is no mention amongst the exceptions noted in the decree, and cited above, of the proper Epistle previously found in the Missal.

VOTIVE MASS OF OUR LADY ON SATURDAY—MOTETS DURING HIGH MASS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. When the Office of the day is S. Maria in Sabbato, may I say the votive Mass of the Immaculate Heart of Mary?

2. Is there any law which forbids the singing of a motet, in a High Mass, at any other time besides at the Offertory and after the *Benedictus*?

ASSISTENS.

REPLY.

1. On Saturdays when the Office is of Our Lady it is forbidden to say a votive Mass of Our Lady, the Mass must be chosen from one of the five allotted for S. Maria in Sabbato. In addition to the rubrics of the Missal, there have been a number of decisions of the Sacred Congregation of Rites concerning the celebration of votive Masses of Our Lady on certain days. A votive Mass of Our Lady is never allowed on a feast in her honour or during the octave of such a feast. It is likewise forbidden on the vigil of the Assumption and the Immaculate Conception. If one wishes to say a Mass in honour of Our Lady on any of these days, one must choose the Mass of the current feast, and it will be celebrated, not *more votivo*, but *more festivo*, i.e., with *Gloria*, and also with *Credo* during a common octave. It may be added that the same rule applies to the celebration of a votive Mass of a Saint, on the vigil, feast, or within the octave of a feast of the same Saint.

2. There is no explicit prohibition which excludes the singing of a motet at any other time, during a High Mass or Missa cantata, than the two mentioned in the query, nevertheless, the practice does not seem to be a commendable one.

Pope Pius X laid down, in His Motu Proprio on Sacred Music, that 'it is not lawful to make the priest at the altar wait longer than the ceremonies allow, for the sake of the singing'. If the Proper of the Mass is sung, as is absolutely obligatory in all sung Masses, it is difficult to know where a motet might be introduced without risking the violation of this rule. Moreover, the same Pope, in discussing the liturgical text, insists that the text of the Mass has been determined, and nothing must be changed, substituted, or omitted. 'It is only allowed', He writes, 'according to the custom of the Roman Church, to sing a motet in honour of the Blessed Sacrament after the *Benedictus* at High Mass. A short motet with words approved by the Church may also be added after the

proper Offertory of the Mass has been sung'. The introduction of a motet at any other time during the Mass certainly seems to be contrary to the spirit of these words. Another consideration that might be adduced is that the choir at a solemn Mass is exercising a liturgical office, it has as its proper function to sing the Proper of the Mass, the celebrant reads the Proper privately and there was a time when he did not read it at all. The choir then should not be adding to the function officially assigned to it by the liturgical books and by the approved custom of the Church.

* * * *

NOTE.

The July issue of the *Record* contained a communication from the Apostolic Delegate in regard to the Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments concerning the celebration of Mass without a server. The Cardinal Prefect of the Congregation of Propaganda Fide has declared that the above Instruction does not apply to Australia and consequently the Bishops still retain the faculty contained in the Formula maior, No. 4: 'Permittendi ut Missa celebrari possit, in casu necessitatis, super altari portatili; etiam sine ministro, et sub dio, et in navi, dummodo debitis cautelis adhibitis, nullum adsit irreverentiae periculum, et locus decens sit; . . .' (cfr. *A.C.R.* xviii, 1941, p. 155).

P. MURPHY.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

THE TRANSACTIONS OF THE CATHOLIC MEDICAL GUILD OF ST. LUKE, edited by N.S.W. Branch, Sydney, 1949. Pp. 61.

The latest issue of the Transactions is a double one, covering the years 1948-49. After a section entitled *General Notes*, dealing with the activities of the Guild in N.S.W., West Australia, South Australia, and the Junior Guild of St. Luke, five interesting papers are given. Dr. John Deakin describes the Fourth International Congress of Catholic Doctors, held at Rome in September, 1949, which was attended by some six hundred doctors; Father R. J. Murphy, S.J., writes an informative account of the celebrated 16th century physician, Fernel; the third paper is a report of an important discussion on the question of Artificial Insemination by doctors and priests; Dr. Doyle, of Boston, contributes a professional paper on The Cervical Spoon. . . . An aid to spermigration and semen sampling; finally, W. E. Crowe describes the aims of the League of St. Thomas More.

The interesting Open Forum on Artificial Insemination and Dr. Doyle's article make this a most valuable addition to an already prized collection. One notes with regret the resignation of Father Murphy as Chaplain. He has been the inspiration of the Guild from its beginning, working over the years to build up the Guild to its present healthy state.

L.B.P.

Homiletics

FEAST OF ALL SAINTS AND COMMEMORATION OF ALL SOULS.

Throughout the year the Church Calendar records the anniversaries of the mighty ones of the Kingdom of God. With exultation Holy Mother Church celebrates the great deeds of her heroes and heroines, proclaims her admiration of their pre-eminent holiness, rejoices in their triumphs and implores their powerful intercession before the throne of God. In letters of gold in the Christian Hall of Fame are inscribed their immortal names "men of renown such as have borne rule in their dominions, men of great power and endowed with wisdom, instructing the people in most holy words, men rich in virtue who gained glory in their generation and were praised in their days. In peace their bodies are buried and their name lives for evermore".

But on the First of November the Church would have us recall the unknown saints of God, that innumerable multitude of ordinary men and women whose lives were known only to God, but who have attained their salvation and rejoice eternally in the vision of the Most High. Of them St. John the Apostle wrote: "I saw a great multitude which no man could number of all nations and tribes and peoples and tongues standing before the Throne and in the sight of the Lamb, clothed with white robes and palms in their hands, and they cried out with a loud voice, saying: 'Salvation to our God Who sitteth upon the throne and to the Lamb'." All Saints' Day is the Feast of those millions of unknown uncanonized saints, of the common people of God's Kingdom, of the ordinary men and women who have saved their souls.

They wrought no world-shaking deeds, their lives were unspectacular, their virtue unremarkable. They lived our lives; they had our worries, our cares, our sorrows. Like ourselves they went the round of daily tasks, prevented by the urgent needs of this life from devoting more than a fraction of their time to pious works. Like ourselves, they felt temptation; like ourselves, they often sinned. From year to year they went on in the same old way; never seeming to get much better, having to work hard to become no worse. Their prayers were often distracted; rarely did they feel fervour in spiritual things; sometimes they were discouraged: ordinary folk they were, just like ourselves. But they kept the Faith, and they kept on trying. And by God's grace, they perse-

vered to the end. And so they saved their souls, and at last are safe with God.

"And I heard a great voice from the Throne saying: 'God will dwell with them and they shall be His people...and He will wipe away all tears from their eyes...and death shall be no more, nor mourning, nor crying, nor sorrow shall be anymore, for the former things have passed away. And they shall receive a kingdom of glory and a crown of beauty, because God hath tried them and found them worthy of Himself'."

Such thoughts should inspire us not only with joy in the triumph of these our very own brethren, but with hope and confidence and trust. What they have done, we also can do: what mercy God has shown to their weakness He is as ready to show to ours. They have gone before us with the sign of Faith, and in this sign we too shall conquer.

But there is another side to the picture, and the Church immediately after the joy of All Saints, shows us the warning of All Souls' Day. Before the all-holy throne of God, nothing defiled can enter in, and many, many are the stains upon our souls. Venial sin is not like mortal sin—a turning away from God, a treachery against Our Lord. It is rather a deviation from the straight and narrow path of perfect virtue, a lack of full co-operation with Our Saviour. A hundred thousand venial sins cannot amount to one mortal sin, but every one of them will leave a stain upon the shining purity of the soul...and every one of them must be purged away before we can be admitted to the vision of God.

And we commit so many venial sins: while we resist one temptation another takes us by surprise. We are distracted at our devotions, negligent in the discharge of our obligations. We perpetrate many small injustices, we frequently fail in charity. We are impatient under trials, and over-indulgent to our senses.

For our grave sins we are, by God's mercy, moved to repentance; but we find it difficult to be sorry for many of our venial faults. We forget most of them as soon as they have been committed. The mortifications and prayers that would remit them we rarely perform, and the penances the Church imposes on us, we seek to escape. And so we go forth, most of us, to face our Judge, defiled with the guilt of a myriad sins, burdened with the debt of penances not fully performed. During the time of mercy we have neglected our opportunities and we have come ill-prepared to the realm of justice. In this life a small good deed

will cancel out a multitude of sins, in the next every fault will be expiated only with great suffering.

We have been warned. Our Lord has said: "Be at agreement with thy adversary on the way, lest the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and thou be cast into prison. Amen I say to thee; thou shalt not go out from thence till thou repay the last farthing".

In the debtors' prison of Purgatory lie countless souls who like ourselves led imperfect lives, and like ourselves paid little heed to the warning of Our Lord. These souls in Purgatory are holy souls; they are in the state of Grace, God's friends and the third division of His Church. True, they suffer at the hands of His justice; but they suffer willingly, knowing that only thus can they fit themselves for the beatific vision and the glory of Heaven. They are our brethren: more fortunate than ourselves in that their salvation is already assured; less favourably placed than us in that their time of merit is over and they can no longer help themselves.

During the month of November the Church sets before our minds the plight of our brethren of the Church suffering and inspires us to make intercession for them. And indeed the love of God, brotherly charity and self-interest combine in urging upon us this holy and wholesome work.

We pray to God: "Thy Kingdom come", and His love urges us ever to work for the spread of that Kingdom on earth. It redounds no less to His Glory, and it is equally pleasing in His sight, to endeavour to bring more speedily into that Kingdom those now detained in Purgatory.

To love our neighbour is the badge which marks us as disciples of Our Lord. If to alleviate bodily evils and relieve temporal distress is purest Christian charity, is it not even greater charity to assist the Souls in Purgatory. If any need help, it is they. No sufferings of this life can compare with the torment and the anguish they must endure. None are so powerless to help themselves as they.

Obviously it is in our own interest to aid the Souls in Purgatory. Some day they will be powerful advocates before the Throne of God for those who have aided them in their time of need. And God's justice will see to it that we who now aid others will not lack help when our time comes: "By the same measure as a man metes out, it will be meted out to him".

Thus November draws all God's family closer round about Him.

The dogma of the Communion of Saints is brought home to our minds as something real, something tremendously important. We rejoice with our brethren of the Church Triumphant endlessly happy in the possession of God, and we are consoled by the knowledge that we have powerful friends at Court. We are moved to sympathy for our brethren of the Church suffering and inspired to re-double our efforts on their behalf. All Saints' Day is a momentary glimpse of the joy awaiting us—a vision to put new heart in us. All Souls' Day is a brief unveiling of the terrible reality of Purgatory—a sight to shock us into effective use of our present opportunities of penance and atonement, precious opportunities so soon to slip forever from our grasp.

W. H. BAKER.

* * * *

SHORT NOTICE.

THE SPIRITUALITY OF SAINT THERESE, by L'Abbe Andre Combes. M. T. Gill and Son Ltd., Dublin. Price, 10/6; ppxii-164.

In Paris, 50 years after the death of St. Therese, a congress of theologians was held. The object of this congress was the development of the theological implications of St. Therese's spiritual doctrine. This book is one of the first fruits of that movement.

In this book, Abbe Combes sets himself the task of trying to see St. Therese's mind at work composing this or that act, and to emphasise the concept of love which inspires it and finds in it its best expression. He stresses what others seem to hold of no account and sometimes discounts their theories. No matter what he does he gives a clear insight to this soul of predilection and makes one want to read more.

The chapter on St. Therese's Theory and Practice of Mental Prayer is excellent and heartening to all who find mental prayer an arduous task. To try and pick the best chapter of the book, one would be placed in a dilemma between the abovementioned chapter and the following one, The Little Way of Spiritual Childhood.

The last ten pages are the deepest and succinctest summary of a saint's life. Some might say, too deep, but who can tell? O Altitudo divitiarum....

F.D.

Notes

Many of our readers will have admired the interesting piece of work H. R. Trevor-Roper did in his book, *The Last Days of Hitler*, London, 1947 (1st edition), which cleared up many points concerning the deaths

THE JESUITS AND THE LAST DAYS OF HITLER.

of Hitler and his henchmen in the famous Bunker (i.e., underground headquarters of Hitler during the siege of Berlin), which had been built fifty feet beneath the Reich Chancellery. And how did the Jesuits come into it? The answer is Mr. H. R. Trevor-Roper, a young don of Oxford, dragged them in. He is, of course, young.

The first occasion concerns Dr. Goebbels. Trevor-Roper thus describes him:

Joseph Goebbels was the intellectual of the Nazi Party; perhaps its only intellectual. The prize pupil of a Jesuit seminary, he retained to the end the distinctive character of his education: he could always prove what he wanted.... it was....this Jesuit suppleness of argument, which made him so much more successful as a preacher than the froth-blowing nationalists of the South. As the Jesuit persuades his penitent that all is well, that he has not really sinned at all, and that the obstacles to belief are really much less formidable than they appear, so Goebbels persuaded the Germans that their defeats were really victories....As the Jesuits created a system of education aimed at preventing knowledge, so Goebbels created a system of propaganda, ironically styled "public enlightenment," which successfully persuaded a people to believe that black was white.¹

Owing to protests (from Fr. Bernard Bassett, S.J., and Prof. E. Munzer, of Quebec) in his second edition (1950), Mr. Trevor-Roper now writes:

....I must admit an error in my description of Goebbels. I stated that he was educated by the Jesuits. Though this is widely believed and repeated, I am satisfied that it is untrue, and that Goebbels learnt that brilliant casuistry that could distinguish between "concrete truth" and "poetic truth" from other sources. The Jesuits, expelled from Germany in 1872, were not readmitted till 1917, and Goebbels, though he was educated at a Roman Catholic *Volkschule* in Rheydt and sent to the university with a grant from the Albertus Verein, cannot have been indoctrinated by them.²

The passage in the second edition now reads:

Joseph Goebbels was the intellectual of the Nazi Party—perhaps its only intellectual. Unlike most of the Party leaders, who sprang with monotonous regularity from Saxony, Bavaria, and Austria, he was a West German, from the Latin Rhineland; and it was the Latin lucidity of his mind, the un-German suppleness of his argument, which made him so much more successful as a preacher than the frothblowing nationalists of the South. Essentially Goebbels was a practical man, a restless, radical character who sought instant and complete results. If he was capable of seeing the truth, he was also capable of despising it: consequently he could use it; and since ideas were to him always currency, never objects of value,

¹Trevor-Roper, *op. cit.*, 1st edition (1947), pp. 18-19.

²Trevor-Roper, *op. cit.*, 2nd Edition (1950), Introduction, p. LVI. He refers to his two informants (Fr. Bassett and Munzer) in a footnote to the same page of his introduction.

he could always prove what he wanted. So he persuaded the Germans that their defeats were always victories.... Whatever else history may say of Dr. Goebbels, it must credit him with one contribution to the science of politics.... a system of propaganda, ironically styled "public enlightenment", which persuaded a people to believe that black was white.³

It will be noted that while the charge that Goebbels was educated by the Jesuits with dire results is withdrawn, because it is a question of fact, and Mr. Trevor-Roper was led astray by an author, as anyone can be and is frequently, no attempt is made to withdraw the other charges. They remain intact, but cannot be applied as the perfect explanation of Dr. Goebbels's craftiness, which he learnt elsewhere. On reading these things when the first edition appeared, one could not feel but shocked that a young and brilliant man, who had before his eyes the awful example of those past masters in lying, should go out of his way to insult a body of men of whom he appears to know little. His book received a cutting review from Father J. Brodrick, S.J., in the *London Tablet* (June 21, 1947), which I had not read before beginning this note. For instance, Father Brodrick wishes to know why does Mr. Trevor-Roper speak so confidently of what passes between a Jesuit confessor and his penitents? Does he assume omniscience because he was attached to the Secret Service during the war? What does he mean by the strange expression: "preventing knowledge"? Mr. Trevor-Roper keeps his counsel, and allows us to assume that he regards as true the wide generalisations that he made. Vague generalisations were the stock in trade of Dr. Goebbels's bright young men.

Trevor-Roper next turns to that sinister figure, Henrich Himmler, whose cruel deeds are a modern horror; yet Himmler was much liked by his subordinates. How can we reconcile cruelty and kindness in one character? Trevor-Roper, as one not unfamiliar with the variety of the human mind, as he puts it, has an illustration and explanation at hand:

It is the Great Inquisitor, the mystic in politics, the man who is prepared to sacrifice humanity to an abstract ideal. The Grand Inquisitors of history... were often painfully conscientious and austere in their personal lives. They were often scrupulously kind to animals, like the blessed Robert Bellarmine, who refused to disturb the fleas in his clothes. Since they could not hope for theological bliss (he said), it would be uncharitable to deny them that carnal refreshment to which alone they could aspire. But for men who, having opportunities of worshipping aright, chose wrong, no remedy was too drastic. So the faggots were piled and lit, and the misbelievers... were burnt, and those gentle old bishops went home to sup on white fish and inexpensive vegetables... while their chaplains sat down... to compose their biographies... knowing (as Cardinal Newman said) that it is better that all humanity should perish eternally than that one venial sin should be committed.

After reading that, Mr. Trevor-Roper cannot blame us if we feel he

³Trevor-Roper, *op. cit.*, 2nd edition (1950), pp. 18-19.

wishes to hurt us. Surely he must have seen that to associate anyone's name with Himmler's would soil that name. How would he have liked it to have someone say that the Nazis had as much regard for truth as the Oxford scholar, H. R. Trevor-Roper?

Notice in the above quotation the number of accusations; they are so floating that they are difficult to answer. First of all let us consider Bellarmine and the fleas. It makes the saint out to be a very eccentric person, indeed, and it hints that he was, also, a dirty person—in passing, however, if Mr. Trevor-Roper should ever leave the bliss of Christ College, and have to live in certain parts of the Antipodes, he would quickly learn that the *pulex irritans* attacks the bathed and unbathed in a most impartial fashion. Trevor-Roper made a mistake in bringing in fleas, as again, Father Brodrick was on the scene to defend Bellarmine, and no man in England knows more about the saint than Brodrick does. He says that Trevor-Roper has misunderstood a story about Bellarmine and *flies*, not *fleas*. Seemingly the saint would not brush flies from his face, and when asked about it, he made a joking explanation of his act of mortification.⁴ This time, however, Mr. Trevor-Roper sticks to his guns and in a note to the text writes:

I have taken the trouble to consult the original source, the contemporary Latin biography by Jacopus Fuligatus, and there find recorded the pious ejaculation of the saint when bitten, in a tender part, "by certain nasty and painful little creatures" (*a certis nequam et damnificis bestiolis*). I doubt if these were flies....⁵

By this, no doubt, Father Brodrick has taken up the question. As regards Bellarmine and the Inquisition, Trevor-Roper rather vaguely refers the reader to Bellarmine's "manual *De Controversiis Fidei*". Hence he leaves the text in the second edition as it was in the first, with the exception that he begins speaking of St. Robert Bellarmine, for the story, as he heard it, was attributed to *Blessed* Robert Bellarmine in the first edition. The gentle old bishops, the inexpensive vegetables and the rest of it remain, with Cardinal Newman, now, saying "that it is better that all humanity should perish in extremest agony than that one single venial sin should be committed". Surely Newman deserves better of Oxford! A Cambridge reviewer rebuked Mr. Trevor-Roper for "sweeping generalisations...all too common among Oxford historians". He could have avoided some generalisations, which would have improved his book and left him to deal with the objections on the main theme of his study.

There are some other instances that Mr. Trevor-Roper has the

⁴The story is found in J. Brodrick, *The Life and Work of Blessed Robert Francis Cardinal Bellarmine, S.J.*, vol. I, p. 420, London, 1928.

⁵Trevor-Roper, *op. cit.*, 2nd edition (1950), p. 22, n. 1.

Catholics on the brain. One of them concerns Himmler, again, and his relations with his masseur, a man called Kersten. Himmler, seemingly, as many men do, became very confidential with this excellent fellow, and discussed serious business with him. Mr. Trevor-Roper's comment is that Kersten "had attained the position which more orthodox believers entrust to a father-confessor. . . ." Of course, this is a mere sneer, but it surprises one coming from such a source.⁶

It is strange Mr. Trevor-Roper did not see that by revealing his dislike for Catholics in general—and surely that is not an uncharitable remark—he weakened his own book. If he makes mistakes so confidently, if he bases his whole sketch of a man's character on that mistake, what are we to think of his other equally confident remarks on the events surrounding Hitler's last days? There was no need to bring the Catholics in, but he wanted to drag them in. The result was unfortunate for him, his book, and for his reputation as an impartial historian.

Finally, to end on a pacific note, *The Last Days of Hitler* is a book which should make us all cautious in historical matters. Here was a case of the circumstances surrounding the death of a man. The author was on the scene quickly; he had at his disposal the force of Military Intelligence. Many witnesses were alive and were questioned. Yet Mr. Trevor-Roper, after most painstaking efforts can only arrive at approximations as regards certain points. What happened to Martin Bormann, Hitler's deputy? How were the bodies of Hitler and his wife disposed of so completely that, to use the expression of Mr. Trevor-Roper, Hitler's burial spot is as mysterious as that of Alaric? Yet how apt we are to speak confidently of events that happened centuries ago, and about which records are so scanty. A great scholar often has remarked that the words 'I don't know' should be constantly on the lips of anyone who aspires to knowledge.⁷

T. VEECH.

⁶2nd edition (1950), p. 26.

⁷Some of the critics of the book have refused Goebbels the title of "intellectual", because of the banality of the published *Diaries* of Dr. Goebbels. Surely the *Diaries* were intended to give no information, which is a reflection, indeed, on the German reading public. The same remark can be made about the recently published *Documents on German Foreign Policy, 1918-1945* (Series D, Vol. 1, London, H.M. Stationery Offices, 1949)—1220 pages, which contain little that was not already public property. The Nazis knew the fate of the Kaiser's *marginalia*! A few points of interest about German relations with the Holy See may be found in pp. 932-1058, particularly some appreciations of Pope Pius XI and his policy.

Book Reviews

BREVIARIUM ROMANUM cum Psalterio secundum novam e textibus primigeniis interpretationem latinam Pii Papae xii auctoritate edito. Editio x Taurinensis juxta Typicam: 4 vols. Marietti, Turin: 1950.

Ever since the Biblical Institute version of the Psalms was allowed—though not imposed—by Pope Pius XII to be used in the recitation of the Divine Office, publishers have preferred it when producing new breviaries. One of the first entrants in the new field was Marietti, whose edition in 18° size has been used by many who bought breviaries in Australia since 1945. An edition in smaller form, 48°, containing the latest offices, has just been published, and it does credit to the enterprising liturgical firm of Turin and Rome. The exact size of a page is 5ins. by 3½ins, and no volume, when bound, exceeds 8ozs. in weight.

Most of us continue long to use the breviary we got before becoming sub-deacons and perhaps we do not now remember what then guided our choice. But the fact is that, amongst young men who in batches acquire new breviaries, taste varies from generation to generation. As regards size, recent years have seen a big number of large, monastic tomes, well suited for choir use, and the choice may have been as fanciful as the fashion in hats or suits, or it may have been so because an attractive small breviary was not obtainable.

The type in the new breviary is as large as that in breviaries frequently classified as medium, although the space between the lines is necessarily less. This compactness, however, does not make reading difficult—the reviewer at least has found it easy—and this desirable effect is due to two factors:—first, the type-face is light and clear, and, second, the paper is excellent.

That convenient repetition of parts which saves turning backwards and forwards in a breviary is quite satisfactory in this one. On comparison with a certain older breviary, well-known for its convenience in this respect, Marietti's 48° is found to be as well arranged, and even better. For example, after the psalms of each nocturn, every day, the appropriate absolution and blessings are indicated by their opening words and the same aid is also given before the lessons in the *Proprium Sanctorum*. Better still, the antiphon and opening words of the versicle for every commemoration are furnished immediately after the prayer of a feast in

which the commemoration is to be made, thus making it unnecessary to turn to the Common.

At the end of each volume are found the Preparation for and Thanksgiving after Mass, litanies, and the other useful accessories of the larger breviaries. The number of pages in the thickest volume, *Pars Verna*, is xxx + 1012 + [350] + (12), and yet these 1404 pages together have a thickness of only $\frac{3}{4}$ in.—owing once again to the fine, high quality Oxford India paper. Roughly, the size of each volume slightly exceeds that of a devout lay person's prayer-book, like "The Treasury of the Sacred Heart," and hence the edition is rightly described by the publishers as *ultratacibile*—most pocketable.

According to the quality of the leather and the finish of the edges, the 48° breviary costs 13,000, 15,000, or 20,000 *lire*, without the Australian "proper".

C.R.

*

*

*

*

CROSSROADS, by M.E.H.,* with a foreword by The Countess of Iddesleigh. (Burns Oates: 120 pages).

This is an excellent little book that may be read through in an hour, but it is a book for the bedside-table of every girl leaving school, and—shall we add—for her mother. It will reach them we hope before they reach the vacuity of mind achieved lately by a Sydney girl who walked about Martin Place with her name and telephone number embroidered on the back of her blouse. How did she sink to such banality? Is she heading for a mention in the case-book of some psychiatrist? And yet she was probably, only a few years ago, a charming little girl. The trouble seems to be that so many girls are reaching adolescence with no basic training in character. The impact of the vulgarity poured out by advertisements, talkies, and song-writers—all this sets up a torment to their senses. One poor, unprepared soul battered by five excited senses. Frustration sets in early.

In her foreword to this valuable booklet, the Countess of Iddesleigh makes some important remarks, as: "A high character, prudent management of the family income, and good manners are the foundation of a successful and harmonious marriage..." Some of the chapters in the book are: Before Marriage, After Marriage, Modern Standards, Baptism and Grace...and in each chapter there are passages of practical advice, such as in the pages under "After Marriage": "Some evenings you will be tired and so will he. He may have business wor-

*A Religious of the I.B.V.M., Ascot, England.

ries that he is determined to keep from you. You, on your side, can camouflage your weariness: a little powder and lipstick perhaps, and a brave effort, will accomplish this". The author touches on the subject of the generation of children, and refers her readers to the Encyclical, *Casti connubii*. There is a good bibliography, which seems to treat exhaustively the duties of husband and wife.

A valuable feature of the book is the collection of Schemes that occupy the last ten pages. They form a carefully arranged synopsis of the chapters, and should be a great help to teachers and parents, because too much thought has gone into the writing of this book to allow it merely an ephemeral interest. One chapter ends with an inspiring paragraph: "Let Christ be the centre of your home and family. Give your children Christ as their friend. Father and mother cleave to Him, the children hold His hand, so are you all held together. Distance, sorrow, death even cannot shatter that, for 'you are all one in Christ Jesus'."

M.O.

*

*

*

*

LA FECONDAZIONE ARTIFICIALE, by Agostino Gemelli, O.F.M., "Vita e Pensiero", Milan. 2nd ed., 1949, pp. 140. 300 lire.

The name of Dr. Agostino Gemelli, for so many years Rector of the University of the Sacred Heart, Milan, is a guarantee of competency for this book. He has been well-known for a long time now as an authority of questions of medicine, biology, and moral science. In this work, written in Italian with many long excerpts from articles in French, much information will be found concerning artificial fecundation, or more correctly, artificial insemination.

Early chapters give an account of the spread of the practice, especially in U.S.A. and in Italy. There follow the opinions of Catholic moral theologians, in particular the now well known view of Fr. Hürth, S.J. (*Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, 1946, 402). Fr. Hürth argues strongly against artificial insemination from moral, juridic and philosophic points of view. A chapter on the problem from a medical aspect discusses the causes of sterility. It bears out the teaching that there are some days, approximately midway between menstruations, when fertility is higher. Dr. Gemelli holds that the methods of artificial in-

semination most favoured by medical men are those which are rejected by moralists, and vice versa. Some of the arguments brought forward, particularly from philosophy are more cogent than others.

Dr. Gemelli himself is very definitely of the opinion that in no case can artificial insemination be justified. Moralists generally distinguish "substituted intercourse", where no normal marriage act takes place, and "assisted intercourse" where before or after a normal act, means are used to make fecundation more easy and probable. Dr. Gemelli rejects both procedures.

The First Appendix gives the original French words of Pius XII to the 4th International Congress of Catholic Doctors, Rome, 29th September, 1949. In that address the Holy Father first branded all "substituted Intercourse" as immoral. He went on, however, to say: "En parlant ainsi, on ne proscriit pas nécessairement l'emploi de certains moyens artificiels destinés uniquement soit à faciliter l'acte naturel, soit à faire atteindre sa fin à l'acte naturel normalement accompli". In the *Gregorianum* (1949, p. 259) Fr. Crusen reasonably saw in these words an approval of "assisted intercourse". Dr. Gemelli seems to have inserted the words of the Pope in his second edition without showing us how his own view accords with them.

In a Second Appendix the views of a Commission of the Church of England, convened by the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1945 to consider the matter, will be found. In general they reject insemination except between husband and wife. Between married persons, however, they think the purpose of fecundation justifies whatever procedure may be used to procure the semen. As might be expected, the Dean of St. Paul's criticises theologians who object to the practice, as "adhering to medieval ideas of human nature and the family", and while he would have the Anglican Church abstain from taking sides, he himself would move with the times, or perhaps drift with the current, and not condemn even the use of the semen of a third party by a married woman.

Finally, a Third Appendix discusses some criticisms that were made of the first edition of the book. There is a copious bibliography of articles from medical and theological reviews.

J.H.

General Index

Contents of Volume XXVII.

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS

(Rev. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S.)	
Baptism, Reply of S.C. of the Holy Office concerning validity of, when conferred in certain sects	101
Bishop P. F. Lyons, Bull appointing, auxiliary bishop to Archbishop of Sydney	298
Bishop Verjus, Introduction of cause of	103
Book by M. da Maura de Freitas placed on Index	197
Cardinal Gilroy, Papal Letter to as Legate to Plenary Council at Bangalore	97, 98
Clerics and Religious, Trading and Traffic forbidden to	198
Communist youth Associations and members, Warning about ..	299
Encyclical <i>Humani Generis</i>	285
Holy Year, concession of indulgences to nuns and others during	3
Holy Year, Extraordinary faculties granted to Penitentiaries and confessors in Rome during	2
Holy Year, Suspension of indulgences during	1
Lawyers, Papal Allocution to ..	100
Malaparte, Curtius, condemnation of book	300
Marriage, Decree about celebration of, between non-catholics ..	7
Marriage, Decree about Communists contracting	7
Mass without a server, Communication from Apostolic Delegation on	199
Masses, Decree of Oriental and Consistorial Congregations about the regulation of	8
Music, Sacred, Letter of S.C. of Seminaries and Universities about teaching of	103
"Oecumenical Movement," Instruction of S.C. of the Holy Office on	191
Organs, Use of electrophonic ...	102
Prayers and pious works, enriched with indulgences, Approval of new collection	300

Servants of God, beatified and canonized during first half of 1950, names of	191
Ughi, Bruno. Condemnation of book of	300

ARTICLES.

Bishop Willson, II, III, IV, V (Rt. Rev. Mgr. J. H. Cullen, V.G.)	33, 115, 224, 317
Created Actuation by the Uncreated Act, I, II, (Rev. J. Kenny, S.J.) ..	130, 210
Dillon of Balmain, I, II, (Rev. R. Wynne) ..	200, 302
Kevin Izod O'Doherty in Australia (Rev. R. Wynne)	22
St. Thomas on Man's Desire for God, III (Rev. T. Muldoon, D.D.) ..	9
St. Thomas's World (Rev. C. Roberts, D.D., Ph.D.) ..	106
St. Thomas's World and his "Ways" (Rev. C. Roberts, D.D., Ph.D.)	311

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY.

(Rev. Thomas Muldoon, D.D.)	
The Theology of the Mass, I. The One True Sacrifice of the New Law	334

MORAL THEOLOGY AND CANON LAW.

(Rt. Rev. Mgr. James Carroll, P.P., D.C.L.)	
Baptism conferred in certain Protestant sects, Validity of	235
Baptism of child of non-Catholic parents in danger of death ...	347
Burial of well-disposed non-Catholic (V. Rev. J. Madden, D.D.) ..	149
De quodam agendi modo in vita coniugali (V. Rev. J. Madden, D.D.) ..	47
Divorce, Members of the Legal Profession and (V. Rev. J. Madden, D.D.) ..	142
Education, Religious, Parents' obligation for child's	351
Faculties subdelegated by bishop, use of, outside one's diocese ..	345

Fast, Eucharistic, for attendants of sick	342
Holy Week Ceremonies, Letter to Editor about	53
Legitimacy and Legitimation in Canon Law	237
Marriage contracted in fear, Convalidation of	243
Marriage invalid through exclusion of indissolubility	50
Marriage of Conscience or Marriage in presence of witnesses only	244
Marriages performed by Pastor in another parish church	239
Mortal Sin, Conditions necessary for (V. Rev. J. Madden, D.D.)	41
Operation, Forbidden (V. Rev. J. Madden, D.D.)	44
Pauline Privilege and Non-Catholics	241
Prohibited Books, Permission to read, granted by former bishop	347
Sin, Occasion of	350
Social Justice, Sins against	349

LITURGY.

(Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D.)	
Baptism of Adult Converts (V. Rev. J. Madden, D.D.)	66
Baptism, Rites at Private (V. Rev. J. Madden, D.D.)	66
Bow to Cross after Last Gospel	248
Burial Service (V. Rev. J. Madden, D.D.)	66
Church and its Furnishings, notes concerning the, II, III, IV, V (Rev. R. F. Donohoe),	59, 154, 246, 353
Common Proper Names, with Latin equivalents	251
Communion in Public Hospitals (V. Rev. J. Madden, D.D.)	66
Converts, Nuptial Blessing for (V. Rev. J. Madden, D.D.)	112
Engagement Ring, Blessing of (V. Rev. J. Madden, D.D.)	160
External Solemnity of certain Feasts (V. Rev. J. Madden, D.D.)	63
<i>Fidelium</i> , The Prayer	248
<i>Fidelium</i> , The Prayer, to whom addressed	354
Indulgences, Suspension of during Holy Year	250

Mass Pro Populo (V. Rev. J. Madden, D.D.)	164
Mass, Votive, Number of Prayers in	354
Mass without a server (<i>See</i> 199, 369) (V. Rev. J. Madden, D.D.)	157
Motets when sung during High Mass	358
Our Lady, Votive mass on Saturday	358
Office, Questions concerning the (V. Rev. J. Madden, D.D.)	161
Popes, Common of	357
Rosary, Arrangement of mysteries of, for days of the week	249
Sanctuary Bell (V. Rev. J. Madden, D.D.)	163
St. John the Baptist, Colour of Vestments on feast of	356
Scapulars and Medals (V. Rev. J. Madden, D.D.)	66
Viaticum, Holy Communion administered as (V. Rev. J. Madden, D.D.)	162

HOMILETICS.

(Rev. Walter Baker, D.D., Ph.D.)	
Feast of All Saints and Commemoration of All Souls	360
Praise of Mary	254
The Blessed Eucharist: Mystery of Faith (Rev. T. Muldoon, D.D.)	168
The Last Words of Our Lord ..	70

NOTES.

Biology versus Catholic Philosophy: A new approach (Rev. J. Burnheim)	267
Catholic Biblical Associations of England, The	333
Contemporary Discussion on the Supernatural Order (Rev. J. Burnheim)	76
Jesuits And the Last Days of Hitler, The (V. Rev. Mgr. T. Veech)	364
On the Validity of the offering of the Mass by a priest separated from the Church (Rev. J. S. Kelly, S.J.)	175
Some New Biblical Works (Rev. W. Leonard, D.D., D.S., S. Rev. W. Keane, S.J., V. Rev. T. Veech)	258

BOOK REVIEWS.

- Acts of the Apostles (trans. Knox) 274
 Admirable Heart of Mary (St. John Eudes) 277
 Breviarium Romanum (Ed. Marietti) 368
 Church and the Young Worker (Cardijn and Langdale) 92
 Crossroads (M.E.H.) 369
 De Novissimis (Piolanti) 85
 De Unione sacerdotis cum Christo sacerdote et Victima (Garrigou-Lagrange) 181
 Divine Crucible, The (M. Austin) 188
 Doctor Communis (Pont. Acad. of St. Thomas) 188
 Eschatology of St. Jerome (O'Connell) 185
 Eternal Priesthood, The (Manning) 274
 Evolution and Philosophy (Duggan) 179
 Fecondazione Artificiale, La (Gemelli) 369
 Furrow, The 234
 Holy Hour, The (Edit. Annals Office) 91
 Holy Year, The (Thurston) ... 300
 Hunter of Souls (Fr. Edmund) . 91
 Israel and the Ancient World (Daniel-Rops) 263
 Justice for the Worker — The Catholic Contribution (Beckett) 190
 Knocknagow: or, The Homes of Tipperary (Kickham) 186
 L'Eglise, Corps du Christ (Goossens) 260
 Letters and Shorter Works (St. John Eudes) 272
 Life of Dean O'Brien 281
 Manual of Extraordinary Minister of Confirmation (Smiddy) . 88
 Now Welcome Summer (Herlihy) 279
 Old Testament (Trans. Knox), Vol. 1, 2 93, 258
 On Englishing the Bible (Knox) 95
 Osterley Selection from the Latin Fathers (Edit. Crehan) 341
 Papuan Conquest (Dupeyrat) ... 257
 Prælectiones Biblicae, N.T., II (Simon-Prado) 273
 Prælectiones Biblicae, V.T., I (Simon-Prado) 184
 Questions and Answers, Vol. 2 (Mahoney) 182
 Religion and the Rise of Western Culture (Dawson) 282
 Rufinus of Aquileia (Murphy) . 183
 St. Francis of Assisi (Karrer) .. 275
 Spirit of God, The (Martindale) 253
 Spiritual Letters (Caussade) ... 90
 Spirituality of Saint Therese (Combes) 363
 Star of the Sea over Crete (Frean) 223
 Studies in Catholic Action (Edit. Aust. Nat. Secretariat of the Cath. Action) 86
 Transactions of the Catholic Medical Guild of St. Luke, The 359
 Way of the Cross (Edit. Bryant) 341
 We live with our eyes open (Van Zeller) 276